

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 21, 1991

The House met at 10 a.m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our prayers cry out this day O gracious God, for those people who are confined without cause and who do not share the liberties we enjoy. We remember especially the hostages who have been separated from their lands and from their families and those they love. May we ever keep them in our prayers that Your spirit will give them comfort and that they will know remedy and release. We remember also their families that they too will be surrounded with Your love and Your benediction. Bless them and us, this day and every day. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] will lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PACKARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 676. An act to provide for testing for the use, in violation of law or Federal regulation, of alcohol or controlled substances by persons who operate aircraft, trains, and commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes.

## SALUTE TO THE FAIRNESS NETWORK

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, a year ago this past January, the Secretary of Defense issued a report on base closure in which he listed as one of the bases to

be closed Naval Ordnance Station located in Louisville, my district. I felt that was not a fair decision based on the equities nor based on the work product at Naval Ordnance.

Along with some of our colleagues in the House, specifically the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BROWDER], the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman of the House Committee on Armed Services, we formed a group called the Fairness Network which, after a year, was able to put on the books, now the law of the land, new guidelines for base closure. Today, the base closure panel, chaired by our distinguished former colleague, Jim Courter of New Jersey, will be holding hearings.

I just want to salute all those who worked in behalf of fairness and objectivity in this base-closure process. We now have an opportunity to downsize the military in connection with its needs but to do so in a fair and objective way.

## STEALTH TECHNOLOGY SAVES LIVES

(Mr. PACKARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, today we will continue consideration of the Defense authorization bill, and once again funding for the B-2 bomber has been cut. If there were any doubts as to the utility of stealth technology, our recent experience in the Persian Gulf should make anyone a believer in stealth.

How important was stealth technology in the gulf war? The F-117 was able to penetrate and destroy the most formidable Iraqi defenses without loss or damage to a single aircraft. With stealth, U.S. and allied forces achieved tactical surprise, giving our forces air superiority from the outset. This was crucial to the remarkable success of Operation Desert Storm.

Perhaps the most beneficial and important aspect of stealth technology is that it saves lives and equipment. As the gulf war demonstrated, stealthy aircraft require far less support to successfully complete a combat mission. By virtue of their invisibility to enemy sensors, stealth aircraft needed no defense suppression prior to attack, and no fighter escorts during their attacks. F-117 missions also required less tanker support. These stealth aircraft were

able to get in close to heavily defended targets and destroy them with great precision. Most importantly, far fewer stealth aircraft were required to complete their missions.

What does all this mean? It means fewer U.S. airmen are put at risk when we use stealth. Fewer aircraft are lost when we use stealth. It means we can establish air superiority faster and more completely, reducing risk to subsequent air, land, and naval operations. To put it simply, stealth saves equipment and, more importantly, stealth saves lives.

## CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION WOULD PUT END TO QUOTAS, JOB DISCRIMINATION

(Mr. BONIOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to engage in a politics that divides us, and plays on our fears.

That has been the strategy the Republican Party has stooped to, pitting men against women, black against white, just to create a phony political issue.

It is much more difficult to bring us together.

But that is the job of leadership.

That is what the Democratic Party has done in writing legislation that will be a major victory for fairness and equal opportunity for all Americans.

With the package of amendments to the civil rights bill that will be introduced today, we will put both job discrimination and quotas out of business.

For the first time, women will have the right to protection from discrimination on the job. America will once again open the doors of opportunity.

We will outlaw the use of quotas, and we will put the politics of fear and divisiveness out of business.

## SUPPORT THE B-2 BOMBER

(Mr. DANNEMEYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DANNEMEYER. Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported the B-2 program because I believe it is essential for the United States to produce a new generation of strategic bombers to replace our aging B-52 fleet and complement the B-1 fleet. The need for a new long-range bomber capable of striking anywhere in the world is par-

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

ticularly critical because of the impending closure of many of our foreign military installations.

The performance of the F-117 Stealth fighter during the Persian Gulf war proves the tremendous utility in stealth technology in actual combat. Iraqi forces were unable to detect, track, and interdict Stealth aircraft. Stealth aircraft were able to penetrate and strike the most formidable Soviet-made air defenses in Iraq. Moreover, not a single F-117 was damaged or destroyed in combat.

Stealth technology saves both lives and money. With Stealth, fewer aircraft are needed to complete a mission, exposing fewer of our airmen to harm's way. Sixty conventional aircraft manned by 132 airmen are needed to accomplish the same mission as two B-2 bombers manned by 4 airmen. Looked at another way, the combined procurement and 20 year operating costs of the conventional air package is \$6.5 billion compared to \$1.3 billion for the B-2 package. Each B-2 may be expensive, but overall the B-2 package is a better value for the taxpayers.

The B-2 combines the survivability of the F-117 with the range and payload of a B-52. The B-2 makes economic and military sense. It is time to build the remaining 60 B-2 bombers requested by the Pentagon.

#### THE COST OF PROTECTING EUROPE

(Mr. SMITH of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, is it not a nice round number, \$2 trillion? Two trillion dollars, almost, actually more than half of the total deficit of the United States.

Can you imagine if we had that \$2 trillion back? That \$2 trillion is what has been spent by the United States in the narrowest view, according to CBO sources in the narrowest view, for our maintenance of protection of our allies in Europe since the end of the Second World War, a burden that the United States taxpayers have paid for every single day of their lives protecting the Europeans from the possibility of being attacked by the Soviet Union—\$2 trillion.

If you took the broad view, it is approximately \$6 trillion that you have spent every day of your lives to protect the Europeans and, today, you are going to hear a discussion about burden sharing.

The Republicans are going to tell you that if we want the European allies to pay their fair share of protecting themselves, it is isolationist and it is protectionist.

Let me tell the Members, folks, you could have made a lot of American jobs for \$2 trillion, and it made Europe real

fat and very safe, and the American taxpayers paid every dime for it.

#### PHONY FIXES TO QUOTA BILL?

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, quotas are not phony. They are real.

Proponents of H.R. 1 are trying desperately to win the support of skeptical Members and are resorting to superficial modifications to do just that. Not only are the modifications phony fixes, but the proponents would have you believe that these so-called fixes are supported by the business community. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to know which business community the proponents are talking about because the phone calls and letters I have received from business men and women in my district are unanimous in their opposition to quotas and huge damage awards for title VII violations.

Mr. Speaker, both small and large businesses oppose these fixes. Even the Business Roundtable, a consortium of over 200 businesses and corporations, oppose these fixes. In fact, AT&T Chairman and CEO Robert Allen, who also chairs BRT's Human Resources Task Force, is quoted in a May 9 statement by the BRT as saying, "as you know, we did not reach a basic understanding on all the issues. Piecemeal amendments of the bill, therefore, cannot receive our support."

Mr. Speaker, these modifications are not supported by the business community and I urge my colleagues not to fall for phony fixes.

□ 1010

#### DEMOCRATIC BURDEN SHARING AMENDMENTS USE COMMON SENSE

(Mr. DURBIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, our budget challenge has put the squeeze on America. We have cut back on housing, adding thousands to the homeless rolls. We have nicked and dined education, leaving college students from working families with diplomas to read while they stand in the unemployment line, considering how they will pay off thousands of dollars in college loans. We have let our highways and bridges deteriorate, knowing this neglect costs our Nation in terms of economic productivity.

We tell America to tighten the belt, but we tell our allies overseas that Uncle Sam has a bottomless wallet. No, we cannot afford to invest in America, but for 45 years we have found the billions of dollars necessary to subsidize

the defense of Japan and Europe. We have spent \$40 billion in the last 10 years to defend Asia while their economies have flourished at our expense. We continue to protect Europe at a cost of over \$100 billion a year from a Communist threat that has disappeared.

Today, Republicans and Democrats on the floor of this House will have a chance to ask our allies to share in the same sacrifice Americans have made for years. President Bush calls it ally bashing to ask Europe and Japan to give up their American subsidies. I call it common sense. Support the Democratic burden sharing amendments. Bring our military policy into the age of modern reality.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS QUOTA ACT JEOPARDIZES SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS

(Mr. IRELAND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, America's 19 million small business owners are essential to our Nation's economic well-being. Their creativity, innovation, and entrepreneurial spirit generate 57 percent of all new jobs in the United States.

Those jobs will be needlessly jeopardized if H.R. 1, the so-called Civil Rights Quota Act of 1991, is passed.

Under this proposed law, if an employer's work force is not an exact reflection of the racial ethnic, and gender makeup of the neighborhood in which the business is located, he or she could be sued for unlimited damages and forced into bankruptcy.

Nothing short of the true \$150,000 cap on damages contained in the Michel substitute will adequately protect our Nation's smaller firms.

Saying you are all for small business is easy. It's how you vote that really counts.

Do not be misled by 11th-hour revisions to H.R. 1 that claim to meet small business concerns. Vote for the Michel substitute and against H.R. 1.

#### ALLIES' FREE RIDE MUST END

(Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today we will vote on a proposition that would get other countries to pay their fair share of the defense bill for the free world. Our country is spending over \$100 billion a year defending other countries. And then we borrow money from our allies so we can pay for their defense.

On the average, we take \$400 apiece from every man, woman, and child in this country so that we can pay for the



defense of Japan, Germany, Italy, France, and others.

The free ride is over. Our allies must start paying their fair share.

Some of our friends say this is ally bashing. Isolationist, they call it. Well, those are the same tired whippers we have all heard from the international big spenders. There is no limit to how much they want to spend, as long as it is for overseas defense activities.

However, some Members say, "The game is up." This country is choking on debt, in part because we pay everybody else's bills. We can no longer afford the free ride.

We will have burden sharing amendments on the floor today to see who in this House will stand up to insist that our friends and allies around the world start paying their fair share. That is not isolationist. That is common sense. Let's put this country back on track by supporting real-cost-sharing agreements.

#### PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SUPERVISION, REGULATION AND INSURANCE OF THE COMMITTEE ON BANKING, FINANCE AND URBAN AFFAIRS TO SIT TODAY AND THE REMAINDER OF THE WEEK DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions Supervision, Regulations and Insurance of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs be allowed to sit during the 5-minute rule today and the remainder of the week for the purposes of marking up the administration's comprehensive banking reform legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. MAZZOLI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION IN RESPONSE TO U.S. LOSSES IN NATIONAL SECURITY TECHNOLOGY

(Mr. REGULA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation, along with senior members from the Committees on Appropriations, Armed Services, Ways and Means, and Public Works, in response to U.S. losses in technologies needed for national security.

A recent Council on Competitiveness report reveals that the strong across-the-board U.S. technological position of a decade ago has deteriorated significantly and the trends are running against us.

Defense experts state that nearly 50 percent of the high technology weaponry used in Iraq was dependent on foreign-produced parts. These products are based on U.S. technology developed in the 1970's but whose production was lost to foreign producers in the trade wars of the 1980's.

Since October of last year, the group has met with industry, as well as Federal officials, to structure a proposal that will effectively add national security concerns to Federal trade and commerce policy.

Government must learn the lesson private industry already knows: It is not enough to develop technology unless you can also transform the knowledge into finished marketable products.

Our bill will establish a workable definition of critical technology based on a machine tool definition, as well as permit private industry producing such products special consideration under our antitrust, tax, and trade laws when our national security becomes impaired.

The measure is GATT compatible.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Members will join us in supporting this important measure.

#### DAMAGE CAPS UNFAIR TO WOMEN

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, during Desert Storm American women were very proud of the strides they had made under their Government. When we looked at how the Kuwaitis and how the Saudis treated their women, we realized that we have come a long way.

Let me just say, as we look at the civil rights bill, let Members not go backward. Let Members not have the United States adopt the Saudi and Kuwaiti way of putting caps on women. Rather, let Members treat women equally, as we have in the past.

I think the pressure should be to try and get the Saudis and the Kuwaitis to act more like Americans, rather than have Americans act more like Saudis and Kuwaitis.

Please, please reconsider the cap which really goes against American women, as they finally attain the right to civil rights. They will not be able to get full rights, and that is wrong.

#### INVITATION FOR FURTHER FAST-TRACK DISCUSSION

(Mr. DREIER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, having heard the remarks of the distinguished ranking Republican on the Committee on Small Business,

the gentleman from Florida [Mr. IRELAND], I cannot help but think of the importance, once again, of passage of fast-track legislation, which we will be considering later this week.

Last night we had a very interesting special order with proponents and opponents of granting the fast-track provisions to the President, Ambassador Hills, and we will once again do that this evening.

We have been successfully, I believe, addressing the concerns of agriculture, the environment, and labor. This evening we will do that again.

I extend, once again, an invitation to those who oppose fast track, for I will, again, enthusiastically yield to those Members to raise any questions which they would like. Therefore, at the end of legislative business, I hope my colleagues who have an interest in this fast track will join Members here.

#### CONTINUE SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ—TRY SADDAM HUSSEIN FOR WAR CRIMES

(Mr. LANTOS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend our Government for insisting that the trade sanctions against Iraq remain in place as long as Saddam Hussein is in charge in Baghdad. It would indeed be immoral and outrageous to have the "Butcher of Baghdad" allowed to be the architect of the reconstruction of Iraq.

Continuing the trade ban against Iraq—which of course prevents Iraq from selling its oil in international markets—is at this stage the most effective way of forcing Saddam Hussein out of power.

When that goal is achieved the United States must lead in putting Saddam Hussein on trial before an international tribunal for war crimes and crimes against humanity. I urge the President to join the many respected leaders around the globe who are demanding a war crime trial for Saddam Hussein—who is responsible for so much suffering by so many.

#### APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2251, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FROM CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND/OR INTEREST FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN AND AROUND IRAQ AS A RESULT OF THE RECENT INVASION OF KUWAIT AND FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER URGENT NEEDS ACT OF 1991

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2251)

making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees, and reserves the right to appoint additional conferees: Messrs. WHITTEN, NATCHER, SMITH of Iowa, YATES, OBEY, ROYBAL, BEVILL, MURTHA, TRAXLER, LEHMAN of Florida, DIXON, FAZIO, HEFNER, MCDADE, MYERS of Indiana, MILLER of Ohio, YOUNG of Florida, EDWARDS of Oklahoma, ROGERS, and SKEDANS.

□ 1020

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE CHENEY BUDGET

(Mr. MCEWEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Speaker, the opening paragraph in the Wall Street Journal editorial today says:

The man who planned America's air campaign against Iraq, Lieutenant General Charles Horner, says the war taught him two main lessons: the importance of Stealth technology and the need to defend against ballistic missiles.

So guess what the U.S. House of Representatives is trying to gut in this year's defense budget? Two things: Stealth and missile defenses.

Mr. Speaker, today the House will consider the Cheney budget alternative to the armed services defense budget. It is the responsible defense budget, the one proposed by the President and supported by the Pentagon, a defense plan that will maintain our strength while reducing the resources we commit to defense.

The Cheney budget is the one opportunity Members have to support stealth technology and the B-2 bomber.

B-2 and Stealth does two things. No. 1, it saves lives, and No. 2, it saves money.

On the chart here we have the explanation of what is necessary in order to drop the same amount of ordnance. In order to send this number of fighters and bombers, you have to have the air escorts, you have to suppress the ground defenses and you have to have the refueling capability. The estimated cost for this actual package that was used in the Desert Storm operation is \$6½ billion.

Under stealth, you do not need the suppression, because they cannot see

it. You can save money, save lives, and be more effective.

Mr. Speaker, common sense says, support the Cheney budget.

#### A TRIBUTE TO STATE REPRESENTATIVE CASTLEMAN

(Mr. HUBBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUBBARD. Mr. Speaker, State Representative Dick Castleman, a longtime friend whom I admired a lot, died Sunday, May 19, at age 64 at Humana Hospital in Louisville, KY.

Last Friday afternoon, Representative Castleman of Mayfield and State Representative Freed Curd of Murray were on their way back to western Kentucky after a meeting of a small business task force in Frankfort, our capital city in Kentucky. They stopped for coffee near Beaver Dam, KY, where Representative Castleman said he felt dizzy and lost consciousness.

When I first moved to Mayfield, KY, in 1962, after law school graduation and service in the U.S. Air Force, I met Graves County Sheriff Dick Castleman. He served 4 years as sheriff, 20 years as Graves county judge/executive and had been Graves County's State Representative since 1987.

My wife Carol and I have been fond of Dick, Robbie and Christy Castleman for many years.

An estimated 1,600 western Kentuckians came to Byrn Funeral Home in Mayfield from 4 to 9 p.m. yesterday to pay tribute to Dick Castleman and express sympathy to his wife Robie, daughter Christy, and other members of his family.

Today, a huge crowd, including about 20 Kentucky senators and representatives and dozens of western Kentucky elected officials, is expected to attend his funeral in Mayfield.

Two of Dick Castleman's best friends, Rep. Curd and Mayfield businessman Wilson Taylor, were both quoted in various media in Kentucky regarding Rep. Castleman's "honesty, diligence and long hours of work" as an elected official. Rep. Curd noted that Rep. Castleman "was very beneficial as a State legislator for western Kentucky by being a member of three key House of Representatives committees: Energy, Transportation, and Appropriations and Revenue."

Dick Castleman was an outstanding Kentuckian who served efficiently and effectively as an elected official toward progress for Graves County and all of Kentucky.

My wife Carol and I extend to Dick Castleman's family our sympathy. Castleman's survivors, in addition to his wife and daughter, include two sisters, Wilmoth Canter of Mayfield and Mary Ellen Dowdy of Flint, MI, and a brother, Raymond Castleman of Flint.

#### SOVIET EMIGRATION LEGISLATION

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet approved in principle the long awaited and far-reaching law on exit and entry. This action represents a significant improvement over existing law and is a further step on the road to true reform within the Soviet Union. As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I am encouraged by this step to conform with their obligations under international agreements including those reached within the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. I would also like to commend Chairman Feodor Burlatskiy for his efforts in ensuring passage of this much needed legislation. This law is a milestone in securing the full freedom of movement of Soviet citizens.

However, Mr. Speaker, based on the latest draft of the law that I have seen, several sections fall short of internationally recognized standards, including those relating to state secrets, personal financial obligations, and military service. I am particularly concerned that extensions of secrecy over the stated 5-year period could be a prescription for indiscriminate and arbitrary visa denials in the future.

However, we are encouraged by the establishment of an appeals process for those individuals denied permission. We would hope that these judicial processes are fair and impartial and not made by secret committees behind closed doors.

Mr. Speaker, it has been indicated that the full provisions may not go into effect until January 1, 1993. However, it is imperative that the Soviets move now to alleviate the current refugee pool of at least 150 families. Individuals such as Vasily Barats and Leonid Kosharovskiy have waited far too long to exercise their right to leave.

Mr. Speaker, let me once again say how pleased I am that this long awaited legislation has passed and reiterate my hope my concerns are taken into account as the Soviet leadership moves to implement and further define this legislation.

#### LESSONS FROM THE PERSIAN GULF WAR

(Mr. HUNTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, the war in the Persian Gulf taught us two basic things: one, that it is important, in fact imperative, to have the capability to shoot down ballistic missiles; and second, it is important, in fact imperative, to develop stealth technology and



the marvelous performance of our F-117's in performing 30 percent of the early missions with just a couple percent of the Air Force inventory that showed us how vital it is to the survival of our pilots and to the effectiveness of our military operation to use Stealth, and our biggest stealth program is now the B-2 program. It is a program that can save the lives of pilots while delivering effective force projection around the world.

Our SDI program manifests all the technologies that we need to be able to move forward to shoot down ballistic missiles.

□ 1030

And, you guessed it, the House Armed Services Committee, and now it appears the House, is going to destroy those two important lessons and two important technologies that devolve from the war in the Middle East, stealth technology and SDI technology.

A "no" vote on this budget is required.

#### A VOTE AGAINST THE DICKINSON AMENDMENT IS A VOTE FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD AND RESERVE

(Mr. MONTGOMERY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona spoke just a minute ago, and he said that we would go into the Committee of the Whole to consider the Armed Services authorization bill and that we should support the Dickinson amendment.

What he failed to tell you was that actually the Dickinson amendment guts the National Guard and Reserves of this country. You ought to know about it, that all Members of this House do have reservists and guardsmen, and if you vote for the Dickinson amendment, you are voting to cut the National Guard and Reserves.

As General Schwarzkopf said on this floor the other day, the Guard and the Reserve in the Persian Gulf were magnificent.

So I ask that you do not support the Dickinson amendment, you stay with the Committee.

#### MEDICARE AND AMERICA'S HEALTH POLICIES NEED TO BE REFORMED

(Mr. APPELGATE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. APPELGATE. Mr. Speaker, the Medicare and American taxpayers are getting bilked out of \$2 billion for faulty equipment through telemarketing. Now, I am not saying that every-

body that is in this business is a crook, but there certainly are a lot of them. They con a lot of unsuspecting sick and old people with faulty equipment and then they sock it to them with inflated prices. I am saying that not all of them do it, but many of them do.

Medicare should be reformed, indeed all of America's health policies need to be reformed, and they need to be reformed now.

We need a national health policy, something that will be affordable to every American in this country, doctors, hospitals, drugs, and quality equipment program which includes prostheses.

The American Medical Association says they are now on board, and corporate America is looking for a modernization and a reformation of health care. I say we ought to all move together to make it available to every American in this country.

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that we have 37 million Americans in the United States of America who cannot afford Medicare.

#### AMERICA GIVES; JAPAN, GERMANY, KOREA, AND THE WORLD TAKE

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, German Chancellor Kohl said yesterday he wants American troops to remain in Europe. Now, isn't that ducky? Wouldn't you?

America spends about \$160 billion a year to protect people overseas. We defend Japan, Japan sends us and sells us Toyotas. We defend Germany, they ship over Mercedes-Benzes. We defend Korea, and they ship over Hyundais.

America gives, gives, gives; Japan, Germany, and Korea and the world take, take, take.

Mr. Speaker, the American taxpayer is sick and tired of doling out military welfare all over the world. They think Congress is stupid for doing it.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is time to send them a bill; vote for the burden-sharing amendment today and let them know in no uncertain terms that the American people are sick and tired of defending Europe while they say many times, "Yankee, go home." You think about it.

#### SOVIET EMIGRATION POLICY: WE SHOULD NOT RESCIND ANY TRADE BARRIERS WITH THE SOVIET UNION NOW

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Soviet Union began taking

steps to codify the free right to emigrate and that, indeed, is a welcome step, something people in America have long waited for.

But before sounding the trumpets and saying that everything is accomplished, we have to be very careful. We first must see the language that the Soviet Union has proposed before rescinding any trade agreements.

For instance, on draft age, will they allow people to come and families to come who have children of draft age? The Soviet draft age is from ages 16 to 27. How many families would leave a 16-year-old behind?

On State secrets, the Soviets characteristically use State secrets as a way to block key people from leaving. How long will those last?

Finally, what kind of forum will there be for appealing family court consent decisions? Most of all, Mr. Speaker, these changes will not go into effect until 1993.

Mr. Speaker, we should not rescind any trade barriers with the Soviet Union until all these questions are answered and the law is codified and written into law.

#### EXECUTIVE SALARIES

(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, our country is now in the midst of a biting recession. But you'd never know it by looking at the salaries of America's top executives: \$18 million for the top gun at United Air Lines; \$16.7 million for the head of Apple Computer; and \$11.6 million for the leader of U.S. surgical. The list goes on. Many of these companies actually lost money last year.

How much is enough? In an earlier era, when America was the world's undisputed economic leader, top executives earned just 25 times what the average worker took home in wages. Today, the gap has widened to 85 times. In Japan, the gap is only 15 times; and in Germany, 23 times.

In a different America, the people on the shop floor were as important to a firm's success as the people in the glass tower. In an earlier America, the fortunes of all rode on the success of the corporation. But things are different in today's America. Last year, corporate profits dropped by 7 percent. Tens of thousands of Americans were laid off from their jobs. But CEO's gave themselves a raise by an average of 7 percent. In today's America, top executives build themselves huge golden parachutes, while average workers are thrown to the dogs of economic change. Some of our captains of industry are becoming nothing more than pirates of American commerce.

Mr. Speaker, it is high time we return to the corporate values that made

this Nation mighty: sacrifice, loyalty, commitment. Not looking out for No. 1, but looking out for each other, and looking out for our Nation.

# NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to House Resolution 156 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2100.

□ 1037

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2100) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, with Mr. DURBIN (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, May 20, 1991, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] had been disposed of.

Pursuant to the rule the Committee will proceed as follows:

First, the Committee will consider the amendment relating to the President's defense budget, to be offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] or his designee, which is debatable for 1 hour.

Second, there will be 1 hour of debate on the subject matter of burdensharing, followed by those amendments pertaining to burdensharing.

Third, the Committee will then consider general amendments printed in part 2 of House report 102-68.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I was going to rise to discuss the schedule with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], but the Chair has stated the schedule as I understand it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to inform the House that our minority leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], will be the designee to offer the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1, printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

## AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. MICHEL:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993".

### SEC. 2. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATIONS.

The provisions of H.R. 2100 as introduced in the House of Representatives on April 25, 1991, are hereby enacted into law.

### SEC. 3. MILITARY CONSTRUCTION AUTHORIZATIONS.

The provisions of H.R. 1208 as introduced in the House of Representatives on February 28, 1991, are hereby enacted into law.

### SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY NATIONAL SECURITY PROGRAMS AUTHORIZATIONS.

Amounts are hereby authorized to be appropriated for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for national security programs of the Department of Energy in the amounts requested in the budget of the President submitted to Congress on February 4, 1991.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], will be recognized for 30 minutes and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] opposed?

Mr. ASPIN. I am, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I should like to announce to the Chair that I would like to name the distinguished ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], to handle the time on our side in my absence, if I might.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] will control the time in support of the amendment.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] will control the 30 minutes of debate in support of the amendment before the committee.

□ 1040

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take a lot of time expressing my support for the mi-

nority leader's substitute amendment because most of my colleagues are already well aware of my views. This is not simply a mischievous Republican amendment, although I am afraid that many of my colleagues on the other side might dismiss it as such. Nor is it a proposed substitute for a secret B-2 vote, an SDI vote, or a referendum on the total force policy rejected by the committee.

The Michel amendment is about leadership; leadership about formulating and managing a coherent national security strategy in a changing but still dangerous world.

Regardless of what any one of us thinks about a specific provision in this bill, H.R. 2100 does not reflect any strategic world outlook. Putting partisanship aside, I do not believe that Congress, comprised of 535 elected individuals, is well equipped to formulate a rational defense policy or strategy. We are good critics of the strategies of others, and we are expert protectors of our own interests.

We are not, however, military planners or national security strategists.

The political process is at odds with any long term vision. It simply is the nature of the beast. Any policy that emerges from Congress is by definition a lowest common denominator solution. We all know the adage that a good compromise is one in which none of those involved is happy with the outcome.

Compromising on the decisionmaking process may pose acceptable risk in some areas of public policy, but not when it comes to the defense of this country. Taking a business as usual approach in planning for our future defense needs at a time when defense spending is declining as dramatically as the world is changing would be irresponsible. History has unequivocally demonstrated this Nation's inability to competently and prudently build down its military forces, after World War I, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam. If Congress continues to address its current postcold war build down as a political lowest common denominator process, history shows that we will once again be putting ourselves at risk and waste.

All of us in this Chamber can point to the Cheney-Powell defense budget, and be critical of something. I can. My colleagues can. But this is not the point. The point is that the Cheney-Powell budget request does reflect a long-term strategic perspective that is driven by fiscal constraints put on the Department of Defense and the administration by this Congress and a changing world.

It does reflect the need for a balanced draw-down of our military personnel. It does reflect the continuing Soviet strategic threat, while acknowledging the virtual disappearance of a threat of a



surprise ground attack from Western Europe.

There is a high degree of centralized planning and analysis that holds the various components of the budget request together. The Cheney-Powell budget, which is embraced by the amendment offered by our distinguished minority leader, is forward looking and does reflect painful, yet careful assessments of priorities in an environment of diminishing resources that have been forced on the Department of Defense by this Congress and by this House.

H.R. 2100 reflects many of the Department's plans, some quite justifiably, but unfortunately, fails to offer any comprehensive strategic view of its own. That is the difference, and that is the problem.

Leadership won the war in the Persian Gulf and leadership will ultimately dictate how well we build down our forces in the years ahead. Until there is some stronger indication of Congress' ability to assume a critical but responsible role in the national security decisionmaking process, I believe that the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs are better able to define and protect our national security interest.

Mr. Chairman, I have received a letter from the President of the United States in support of the amendment to be offered, which is now being discussed and offered by our minority leader, as well as a letter from General Powell.

Mr. Chairman, the letters to which I referred are as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
WASHINGTON, MAY 20, 1991.

Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON,  
Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services,  
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DICKINSON: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992 and 1993 (H.R. 2100) as reported by the House Armed Services Committee fails to meet the needs of the Nation's defense. If I am presented the bill reported by the Committee, I will veto it.

With the changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and with the limitations on resources available for national defense, we plan substantial reductions in the coming years in the size of the U.S. armed forces. To provide forces capable of meeting future challenges within the fiscal limits that American taxpayers can afford, we must spend funds available for national defense with maximum efficiency. There is no room for pork-barrel spending or politics as usual in Congress.

The bill reported by the Committee terminated the B-2 Stealth bomber program that is vital to our defense in the next century. Also, despite the increasing need for effective defenses against missile attacks, the Committee bill slashes funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative, and especially the important Brilliant Pebbles program. While cutting funding for these and other crucial programs, the bill funds unneeded items such as excessive procurement of aircraft and other weapons systems. Finally, the bill prevents the reduction in the size of the Reserve

and National Guard components of the armed forces needed for a carefully balanced and effective force structure.

The bipartisan leadership of the Congress and I have agreed to limits on the amounts which we will spend in the next few years on defense. We must spend these funds wisely if we are to provide the American people with the armed forces needed to defend the Nation and its interests around the globe. I urge the House of Representatives to produce a bill that reflects America's real defense needs, in lieu of the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Similar letters have been sent to the Speaker and Congressmen Michel and Aspin.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.

CHAIRMAN OF THE  
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,  
WASHINGTON, DC, MAY 20, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Minority Leader of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: I am writing to provide my full support to the President's defense program for FY 92 and 93 which Secretary Cheney and I and all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been supporting in testimony.

I want to assure the Members of Congress that the President's program is a very carefully balanced program; one that is responsive to the changing geopolitical situation; one that is fiscally responsible; and one that is consistent with last year's budget summit agreement.

It was not easy putting this program together. Many tradeoffs were made; many programs were eliminated; and the force structure was reduced to insure that it could be fully supported and maintained. The resulting Base Force, as we call it, is the minimum force needed in each service to execute current national security policy and to protect our Nation's interests around the world. It is finely tuned force and significant changes in the budget request will unbalance the Base Force.

I am deeply concerned that some of the actions being considered by the House would upset that fine balance. For that reason, I strongly reaffirm my support and the support of the JCS for the President's program as submitted and for the Michel-Dickinson Amendment to the House authorization bill which reaffirms the President's program.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL,  
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

I would ask a yes vote on the Michel amendment because it is prudent. It is necessary. It is common sense, and it reflects the best thinking of those who have the responsibility for protecting this Nation and not parochial interests.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the committee bill and opposed to the Dickinson-Michel substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the basic problem with the Dickinson-Michel substitute is it offers the Cheney bill without any changes at all. The Cheney defense bill was put together before Desert Storm, so we have no lessons from Desert Storm in the Cheney bill at all. It was

put together in the Pentagon last fall, during the time of Desert Shield.

It was sent over here at about the time the war began. It reflects nothing that happened in the war. It is counterintuitive to think that we should have had a war deploying half a million people, 6 weeks of an air campaign, 100 hours of ground combat, and somehow it does not change anything.

What is the matter with the notion that you ought to at least make some changes in the budget that the President sent over, which was unrelated to the war that we have just had? This year the Committee on Armed Services focused very acutely on the procurement requirements in light of the changes in the Persian Gulf and, of course, in light of the changes brought about by the uncertainties in the Soviet Union.

Based on the committee's hearings and careful analysis of the information that has been developed from them, we basically developed four guidelines, four basic guidelines that have been used as a foundation to help us make decisions on this military of the future. And I would like to talk about them in the context of the kind of programs that we have.

First of all, it must be noted that the Cheney budget still has some problems making the out year budget numbers. CBO reports that, in fact, about 40 billion dollars' worth of excess spending is built into the Cheney budget.

We have programs that, if you continue the Cheney budget, we will be over the budget numbers by about \$40 billion at the end of this decade. Where are we going to get the money? Where are we going to get the money?

What we do is try to adjust that. What we do is say, let us stop funding the B-2 after 15 planes. Let us make sure that we have an SDI Program that is geared toward fiscal responsibility as well as defending the United States from the immediate threats of ballistic missiles.

A smaller scale SDI Program, cutting the funding from the B-2 after 15 planes, all of this is to try and make the budget fit with the expectation that we are not going to get much increase in defense spending, that whatever the defense spending we get at the end of this 5-year current budget agreement is, that is what we are going to have to live with, in which case the Cheney budget is underfunded; CBO says it's underfunded by about \$40 billion per year in the mid-1990's.

The second principle that we apply here in putting together this budget is, we should continue to improve our conventional capabilities. The success of our forces in Operation Desert Storm reinforces the need to enhance our defensive capabilities and provide for troop survivability.

Here the procurement action includes additional funds to buy improved Pa-

triot missiles, institution of a program to enhance survivability of the Bradley fleet, additional funding to remanufacture F-14A aircraft, additional funds for more SLAM standoff weapons, and funds to rewing and modify the Navy's A-6 aircraft.

The third principle that we adopted is that we should adopt more rigorous standards for decisions to proceed or to continue with procurement programs. In essence, we should take the time to design and test weapons the right way before we invest heavily in them.

What is reflected in our bill in that principle is some special access programs and changes that we made in the C-17 transport aircraft program.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we should hedge against uncertainties. We must be ready to counter any changes in current trends.

□ 1050

Specifically we know that we need to enhance current equipment as we develop the next generation of equipment. In this context, the committee recommendation is additional funds for continued modernization of Guard and Reserve forces, reinstating the tank upgrade programs, additional funds for procurement of AHIP helicopters, and direction to extend the multiyear contract for the F-16 through fiscal year 1994.

Mr. Chairman, that is basically the outline of our program. The trouble with throwing out all the work the committee has done and going back to the Cheney budget at this point is two things. No. 1, the Cheney budget has problems—as we discussed at our hearings and as CBO has laid out—with its funding in the long term after the 5-year period. It has an annual \$40 billion bulge it has to deal with. The Cheney budget does not address that. We think we address that in our budget.

Second, the Cheney budget was concocted, conceived, put together, and set up, before Desert Storm. If we go back and vote for the Cheney budget, it is as if Desert Storm never happened.

We spent a lot of time in our hearing trying to incorporate some of the lessons learned from Desert Storm and incorporate them into our bill. If Members have objection to what the committee has done, they have an opportunity to offer specific amendments to that bill and to vote on those specific amendments. To come in with the idea of just going all the way back to the Cheney budget, I think at this point is irresponsible.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the very distinguished and capable gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, let me take on a point or two that was just made by the chairman of the commit-

tee. The last point of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] was that the Cheney budget, and I think it is more appropriate to say the Cheney-Powell-Schwarzkopf budget, does not take into consideration the lessons of Desert Storm.

What were the lessons of Desert Storm? I think the two most important lessons of Desert Storm were that stealth is extremely valuable, that it is very cost effective, and that it is militarily effective. Second, that it is important to be able to shoot down incoming ballistic missiles.

We saw that manifest itself for the first time with the Scud missiles, which are ballistic missiles, being hit by other missiles, the Patriot system, over the sands of the Middle East.

Whose budget recognizes those lessons that were derived from Desert Storm? The administration's request for stopping missiles, that is, SDI, and that includes stopping fast missiles as well as slow missiles, was \$5.1 billion. The committee's recommended authorization was only \$2.7 billion, plus \$857 million, or less than a billion dollars, for theater ballistic missile defense systems.

So the point was the grand lesson of the Middle East, that is, that we now live in an age of missiles, and we have other nations like Pakistan, China, Iran, Brazil, and Argentina proliferating ballistic missiles, and we have to learn to stop missiles if we are going to discharge our constitutional responsibility to protect our people and military. That was a lesson of the Middle East. The committee budget disregards that lesson.

Mr. Chairman, it is the Cheney-Schwarzkopf-Powell budget that recognizes that lesson and puts in \$5.1 billion for development and research in stopping missiles. That is what the American people want.

Mr. Chairman, I think if they look at the leadership of those people that ran this war, and that under the new system, look at the fact that General Schwarzkopf, as commander in chief of the Central Command, has input into this budget, just like other commanders in chief, the other CINC's, we see now our warfighting people, our warriors in the field, are the people that put together the Cheney budget. Not Congressmen, not people like myself and others, with constituents' requests that include considerations like jobs, but simply people who are out there fighting for American security, who have only one interest and only one constituent, and that is an effective fighting force.

Mr. Chairman, let me just relay the list of countries that presently are engaged in developing ballistic missiles. This is why we have \$5.1 billion in the SDI account in the Cheney budget.

We have Iraq, which has, I would say, a limited inventory at this time be-

cause of the Patriot missile system; China, which is proliferating a new ICBM and selling it all over the world; Libya, Iran, Argentina, Brazil, North Korea, Pakistan, and Syria.

All of those countries are proliferating ballistic missiles, and we in the U.S. Congress are not learning the lesson, that it is going to be important for us to stop them.

Mr. Chairman, lastly let me simply say the concept of Stealth has been validated in the Middle East, and that is another important lesson that we are ignoring by destroying the B-2 program in this particular budget. The fact that you can send out aircraft, have them hit their target with precision, and come back with pilots and crew intact, is a very, very valuable lesson for the United States. Assets that can do that are very, very valuable assets.

Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude on this serious note. Stealth will save lives in the future and will protect American power with a minimum of American losses. That is why we need the B-2 that is in the Cheney budget. It is not in the committee budget.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak against the amendment. This amendment goes really to the heart of the legislative process. Our committee has done a great deal of work, had a series of hearings, and much effort has been put into it, not the least of it some of my personal effort in some of these areas.

Mr. Chairman, what I want to stress more than anything is that this is not a B-2 amendment. I am for the B-2. This country needs the B-2 Stealth bomber, without question. I know that sooner or later we will have that technology and we will have that weapons system as part of our national security and our national defense.

Mr. Chairman, this is buying far more than that. There will be the right time to discuss and to obtain the B-2 system, and I know that will come to pass.

But let me point out a few of the problems that this particular amendment posed for us on the committee.

It would not fund the SDI system at our level. It would have far more, and I think probably funded in such a way as would not be productive in attempting to defend ourselves against these possible threats. Also our bill puts theater missile defense in its own office. This is a lesson we have learned from Desert Storm.

Mr. Chairman, our bill in particular has positive measures that are left out of this amendment. We extend the F-16 line. We upgrade the M-1 tanks. This is so terribly important. We cannot stop that type of production, because we saw the importance of those in Desert



Storm and how well they worked with our young men in the desert against the Iraqi forces.

Our bill continues support for the V-22, which quite honestly looks like it is a situation where it is cheaper than the alternative plan, one that we have looked at extensively, and is a positive part of our bill.

Mr. Chairman, we upgrade the Bradley fighting vehicles, which we know were an integral part of Desert Storm. They can be made better for any future conflicts. Also research and development funds were increased for mine and barrier neutralization.

□ 1100

If we learned anything in Desert Storm and in the Persian Gulf, we see that we need areas such as the mine and barrier neutralization, work in research and development, because many of the casualties that we received by our forces over there were in this area, and to accept this amendment would throw out all of that work by our committee.

We should not be led to believe that this is a B-2 amendment. Give us the time and the place for the B-2, that will come to pass, but this is not the place nor the vehicle to get it.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY].

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise on behalf of the Michel amendment and to speak on behalf of the right of the Department of Defense to plan a restructuring of our Nation's defense for the future of this Nation's security without parochial congressional meddling.

This Congress has repeatedly over the last several years, and clearly indicated its intention for the next several years, asked the Pentagon to take the reductions in spending. The Pentagon has done so. It stood up to the plate and it said, "We will accept our share of the responsibility for spending reductions in order to control this massive deficit problem this Nation faces," and they have done so with greater good humor, with greater willingness to go to work on the problem, with less footdragging and less complaining than virtually any other agency representing any other sector of the budget or any other Member of Congress representing any parochial interest.

The Secretary of Defense has put together a plan that allows us to reduce the overall size of the military, increase its technological and strategic ability relying on the single greatest advantage in defense that this Nation has, superior technology, technology that has allowed us in the Middle East just recently to do greater harm to an enemy with less damage to our own troops and to innocent civilians than

at any time in any military conflict in the history of the world.

Relying on the technology in this plan proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL], we emphasized that technology with the B-2, with strategic defense initiative, with the planning and the coordinated efforts of the Pentagon, realizing that they must scale down and do so in an intelligent manner that maximizes our strength, we have an opportunity today, if we vote for the Michel effort, to put strategic planning ahead of parochial interests.

I say vote for the Michel amendment. Give our Pentagon and our defense a chance.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Michel amendment. Among other things, the Michel amendment will correct one of the most glaring flaws in the committee bill: The provision effectively killing the B-2 Stealth bomber.

The committee decided to kill the bomber against the strong wishes of the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Air Force leadership, and the air commanders who won the Persian Gulf war. It is, in my judgment, a highly irresponsible position.

The issue involved is quite basic: Do we need a manned bomber or don't we? For if we do not build the B-2 Stealth bomber, then early in the next century, we will find ourselves without an effective bomber force for the first time in the modern age.

Right now, our bomber force consists of B-2's and B-1B's. As early as 1993, this force will be reduced to 200 aircraft, half of which will be over 30 years old. By the year 2010, even the youngest B-52's will be over 50 years old—older than the fathers of the men who would fly them. Those still in operation will be virtually useless. That will leave us with less than 100 B-1's, far too few to serve the nuclear deterrence role, let alone be available for conventional operations.

Our Nation cannot afford to be in such a situation. Like control of the seas, the ability to penetrate an adversary's air space is a basic military capability that the United States always will need to maintain.

Any war or threat imaginable—from a full-scale nuclear showdown—now unlikely—to a major ground war to a smaller Third World conflict—all will require a heavy bomber. Indeed, we have used our B-52's in nearly every major military operation since they came on the flight line. They saw action in Vietnam and Iraq. They were prepared for action in every incident from the Cuban missile crisis to the Iranian hostage crisis. To recognize the value of heavy bombers in the past, and then to kill the B-2 and leave us without a significant bomber force, is an untenable stand. We would be highly irresponsible to leave our successors in that position.

Let me address the issue of cost, the only objection that can be raised against the B-2. Contrary to the impression given by various disarmament groups, the Stealth bomber is not an unusually expensive weapons system. Even during its peak funding year, it will absorb a smaller portion of the defense budget than any of its predecessors, including the B-1, the B-52, the B-47, and the B-36. We

have always been willing to pay for this essential military capability and we should continue to do so. Moreover, we will spend more money on at least five other Defense programs in the years ahead. If we are willing to sink billions into such programs as the AEGIS cruiser or the *Seawolf* submarine, systems that add to existing capabilities, we should be willing to save our manned bomber force from virtual extinction.

Finally, we have already invested a high amount in the B-2, money which we will not recover if we terminate the program. If the Congress votes to kill the B-2, it will be voting to throw \$36 billion down the drain. That would be unwise.

Let me say in closing that this is not an easy vote for me. The V-22 Osprey and the F-16, programs that I strongly support, would both be greatly reduced if this amendment were enacted in full. It is my hope and expectation that by the time this legislation process is completed, these weapons systems will receive the necessary funding. Nevertheless, I have chosen to vote for the Michel amendment as an expression of my support for the B-2 and the strategic defense initiative, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

An invisible plane is a good thing to have. Vote "yes" on the Michel amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the committee bill as reported. I do not take this position lightly—there are numerous provisions in the Cheney budget that make good sense and will eventually save money. However, many of these new and innovative provisions have not been fully developed and, in my view, require more time to mature. World events have changed many of the parameters in which the Department of Defense must operate. I believe it is the responsibility of Congress to make the necessary adjustments in this defense budget that reflect the reality of these changing world events.

The success this Nation achieved during the gulf war is directly attributable to the state of readiness of our Armed Forces. This state of readiness could not have been possible without the attention Congress has placed on readiness during the past several years. The active role of the Committee on Armed Services, and the Readiness Subcommittee, is, I believe, responsible for this increased attention.

In formulating the committee's recommended budget request, the Readiness Subcommittee, which I chair, held over 15 separate hearings. During these hearings, the committee heard from all levels of the Defense Department, experts from the General Accounting Office, and other qualified witnesses during our review of the administration's request.

Mr. Chairman, the committee budget recommendation contains several beneficial provisions. The Readiness Subcommittee has provided additional

funding for the rapid deployment of special operations forces which were extensively employed during the gulf war. The subcommittee fully funded the readiness and training for the reserve end-strength restoration contained in the committee recommendation. The subcommittee continues its attack on the problem of nearly \$35 billion of excessive inventories. The subcommittee included additional specific funds for improved quality of life projects for Navy personnel and their families in the Mediterranean region. The department's request for environmental restoration was fully funded, and we generally supported the administration's request for drug interdiction. The subcommittee restored funding to the Air Force Junior ROTC to ensure this program continues to instill leadership values in our Nation's high school students.

One of the major adjustments the subcommittee has recommended calls for long needed improvements in chemical warfare equipment and training. Our experiences in the gulf war have brought these deficiencies to our attention.

The subcommittee acted to protect the logistics and supply infrastructure of the Department of Defense by protecting depot workload and preventing premature supply center consolidations. The Readiness Subcommittee continued this year to reduce levels of foreign national employees and forced the development of a more orderly reduction and coherent management of American workers in the Department of Defense.

Another major adjustment to the administration's request is the denial of the defense business operating fund, or DBOF. There is no argument with the concept of identifying costs and saving money and operating the Department of Defense in a more businesslike manner. However, every admiral, general, and assistant secretary, except one, who was asked to explain the DBOF and its impact, could not. Most of these high-level defense managers stated they were not consulted during the formation of the DBOF. The General Accounting Office testified that adequate controls and systems were not in place to allow for this restructuring of the budget. Based on all of these uncertainties, the committee recommended the DBOF not be implemented until our concerns are addressed.

Mr. Chairman, the committee recommendation is more attuned to the environment in which DOD must operate and fiscal realities. The committee's recommendation recognizes that our Armed Forces must be well trained and equipped, flexible, and ready to meet any contingency anywhere in the world, and reflects what we believe will continue to maintain the readiness of our forces during the coming pivotal years for the Department of Defense.

I urge all of my colleagues here today to continue the support they have shown for our Armed Forces and maintain an acceptable level of readiness that is contained in this bill.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY], who is not a member of the committee but who is very vitally concerned with our national interests.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, the majority's defense strategy reminds me of the old Carter defense strategy. Just as Carter had no credibility in defense, so does the majority in this House have no credibility in defense.

The majority must be upset because they could not micromanage Desert Storm, so they are going to try to micromanage the defense buildup.

I respectfully submit that the majority's defense will cost lives, civilian lives as well as military lives. Stealth technology has proven to save lives on both sides of the battle lines, yet the majority wants to stop the Stealth B-2 bomber.

SDI will save American civilian lives. Not protecting American families from missile attacks is immoral.

The way the majority wants to implement total force drawdown will cost military lives. The majority cut four active-duty personnel for every reservist. Now, we have to have a highly mobile defense structure. Can you imagine how many lives would have been lost if we had a force structure envisioned by the majority and Saddam Hussein attacked Saudi Arabia while we waited to mobilize the reserves?

As we witnessed in the debate yesterday, the majority's vision of defense is to negotiate with our enemies while we cut the very heart out of our military, all the while keeping unwanted weapons systems for our own congressional districts.

The Michel substitute is an objective, reasoned military drawdown and buildup. The Michel substitute saves lives.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the Michel substitute.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS].

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, I rise in opposition to the Dickinson substitute, and I do so in my capacity as chair of the Research and Development Subcommittee.

I think adoption of this amendment certainly has specific consequences for the changes made by the Subcommittee on Research and Development. But, before I attempt to enumerate in the few minutes that I have remaining

some of the specific consequences of the adoption of this substitute for changes made in R&D, I would just like to respond to an argument made by a couple of my colleagues who have preceded me in the well.

Mr. Chairman, I would think that the argument that the Committee on Armed Services, indeed, the House of Representatives is engaging in micromanagement of the administration's request is a rather disingenuous argument, because if you take the argument of micromanaging and parochial interest to the logical conclusion, one would ask what then is the role of the Congress of the United States. Why not simply eliminate us? If the only function here is to take the administration's request verbatim, bring it to the floor and adopt it, then why are we being paid?

□ 1110

We have a responsibility to evaluate and to assess. We have a responsibility to bring our political concerns, our fiduciary responsibilities to bear on that budget. We have done so.

To adopt the Dickinson amendment, euphemistically referred to as the Cheney-Powell-Schwarzkopf amendment, and I think that is a slight journey into fantasy. However, I would rather refer to it as the Dickinson amendment, with the following consequences for research and development: One, a decrease in authorization for research and development of over \$800 million, eliminating all of the changes made to programs in the bill reported to the floor; elimination of the committee's initiatives to increase funding for technology and industrial base, efforts that will help keep this Nation competitive in many areas; reduction in additional funds provided for environmental programs to identify the causes of pollution by the military, to programs developing better ways to prevent pollution, and research into new methods and technology to restore the environment; reduction in programs where increased research was provided to systems that would help protect our troops, reacting to problems identified during Operation Desert Storm; elimination of additional funds provided to enhance and improve the only Stealth aircraft in our inventory, the F-117; elimination of all funds to continue research on the V-22 Osprey aircraft supported by the majority of this House for many years. It would not address many of the changes requested in the administration's revised budget. These programs include new early warning satellite system, additional funds for the F/A-18, the C-17, and Air Defense Initiative.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, SDI would be funded at the request of \$4.6 billion, and theater missile defense would once again be placed under the control of SDIO, and amendments to do the very



same things were made in order by the Committee on Rules yesterday when the opportunity presented itself to allow these two amendments to be offered. I find it fascinating and interesting the two amendments were not, indeed, offered.

For these reasons and many more that time does not permit me to enunciate and elaborate upon at this time, I urge my colleagues to defeat the amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY], one of the most able and progressive members of our committee.

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, there are three aspects of the committee bill that should convince Members of this body to vote against it and for the Michel substitute.

No. 1, it stops production of the B-2; No. 2, it guts strategic defense, it guts SDI, No. 3, it draws down the Guard/Reserve much less than it should. Certainly not in the 1-to-1 ratio recommended by the Pentagon. Many of these Guard/Reserve units will have no mission when the active duty units they are there to support are gone.

However, there is one underlying reason to vote against the committee bill. That is, that it clings to the past and it ignores the future. It clings to the past, in which Members had the opportunity to have free spending, big defense budgets, where we could both prepare our troops for the future and spend money in everybody's congressional districts. Those days are gone.

It clings to the past, when the doctrine of mutually assured destruction made some sense. It clings to the past when we did not have the threat of proliferation of missiles in Third World countries.

The future holds that that threat will be there. We know it. We just saw it in the Middle East. This committee report ignores that threat.

Mikhail Gorbachev has said that history punishes those who come late to it. Do not let the United States come late to history. Let the United States prepare for what we know will be the future threats. That means SDI. Vote against the committee bill and for the Michel substitute.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute for H.R. 2100.

We are told that the purpose of the substitute is to afford Members the opportunity to vote on the administration's budget request as an alternative to the committee bill. Mr. Chairman, the substitute does not provide such an opportunity.

Indeed, it is the committee bill that incorporates the President's amendment to the budget request to satisfy

essential near and longer term naval aviation requirements—not the substitute. And, it is the committee bill that provides for emerging lessons from Operation Desert Storm—not the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the substitute cannot reflect the administration's position at this time, because it assumes the President did not amend the budget request, and that the gulf war did not occur.

I must point out, too, that some very important policy issues would be wiped out if the substitute is approved.

On the home front, the committee approved proposals that will help our Nation's small businesses. Desert Storm troop deployments, demonstrated the large degree to which small businesses near major military installations depend on these installations. While many of the forces deployed have now returned, the economic aftershock, that devastated many small businesses was so severe, that economic recovery is not complete.

The committee provided, therefore, that a portion of the \$200 million in support of the defense economic adjustment program be used for emergency loans to small businesses suffering economic damage due to the Desert Storm deployments. Congressman CHET EDWARDS deserves credit for his efforts to see that this need was addressed. And I thank my friend JOHN LAFALCE, chairman of the Small Business Committee on which I also serve, for his support.

But this helping hand to our small businesses would be wiped out by the substitute.

In addition, my good friend, Congressman RICHARD RAY should be commended for the effort he put into a very excellent proposal to ensure that subcontractors are paid for work performed. This is not a response to an isolated incident. It is a very real and persistent problem, in which subcontractors are often left holding the bag—they're not paid for their work, although the prime contractor has received payment from the Federal Government.

This is just another example of the initiatives that would be wiped out by the substitute.

For all these reasons and more, I urge my colleagues to reject the substitute in favor of the committee bill. The committee bill provides for a balanced and prudent package, based on careful analysis of information from hearings, the gulf war and the administration's own budget amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] has 14½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Would the gentleman from Wisconsin restate his request.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, we ask to strike the last word for the extra 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman may claim that additional debate time at this point since debate is proceeding on an amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KYL).

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, our choice is clear. We can either support President Bush, Secretary Cheney, and General Powell, or we can support the Committee on Armed Services majority. I suppose the question is, who do you trust to do the best job of putting a budget together? Those who planned and successfully executed the war against Iraq, or the majority members of the Committee on Armed Services, each pushing or protecting what they think is more important?

Last year, the Committee on Armed Services insisted that Secretary Cheney rethink defense planning, in light of evolving world conditions.

□ 1120

Secretary Cheney did that, and the Bush budget, the Cheney budget, reflects the new realities, including, I might add, the war with Iraq; but the committee majority has simply conducted business as usual. In essence, Members are asked, "What do you want?"

It is all added up and when the total bill is determined, then that which is necessary to pay for it is taken from programs like SDI and B-2, and then you have a bill.

That may be a bit of an oversimplification. And of course Congress has a responsibility to do its own analysis; but that is the point. It is a responsibility.

I submit that my committee failed in its responsibility, not that it has none.

So who do you trust for a strategic overview of things, the committee or the President and the Secretary of Defense?

Now, the chairman has said that the problem with the Michel substitute is that the Cheney budget was put together before the war; did the war not change anything he asked?

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the same people who successfully planned the war did an equally good job in planning the defense budget and anticipating the threats caused by Iraq. It is the committee that failed to take into account the war, and it acted after the war.

What are some of the lessons learned? We have heard about them: That Stealth works, but the committee does not support Stealth; that ballistic

missile defenses are needed, and they work, but the committee did not support ballistic missile defenses.

Oh, they say, we are all for theater defenses, but nobody has told me where a theater begins and ends and nobody has told me why it is moral and just to protect the people within a theater, but not the people a mile outside the theater.

Do not American civilians count?

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that readiness and high technology won this war, not National Guard armories back home or out-dated equipment that the Defense Department does not need.

And on the question of the CBO analysis, this committee stuffed more things into this bill without any idea of how it is going to affect out-years' spending than Secretary Cheney could even dream about; so I do not think we can say that the committee bill will conform to the CBO analysis and that the bill of the President and the Secretary will not.

The bottom line, Mr. Chairman, is that the committee has not improved upon the Cheney-Bush budget. The President's budget may not be perfect, but it is a lot closer to a real strategy for defense than the budget put together by the majority of the committee.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2100.

I regret very much that I must oppose the Dickinson amendment.

H.R. 2100 is a balanced bill and the Secretary of Defense understands that. Secretary Cheney submitted a budget that has a 5-year built-in reduction of about 4 percent per year, which is endorsed by the administration.

Now, 4 percent deducted from almost \$300 billion of this year's defense bill simply demands that we cannot fund some programs that we would very much like to have, programs that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] endorses and some of us do also; but we simply just do not have the funding to approve those programs.

H.R. 2100 does fund, however, specific and necessary priorities, endorsed by Democrats and Republicans.

It is clear that H.R. 2100 is dedicated to a workable defense which meets the Department of Defense bill build-down and reduction philosophy. We based our defense decisions in the committee on what works and will work in actual military practices, not just on abstract or theoretical arguments, and we had a number of hearings, and our bill is based on those hearings. Our bill passed out of the committee, as you know.

We have funded, Mr. Chairman, a ballistic missile system and defense system that works, an all-volunteer force

that works, equipment that works, stealth systems that we need, a strong National Guard and Reserve force, and we have funded more research and development money than the administration requested.

In short, I think we have a balanced bill. I regret that we cannot do business as usual and that some worthwhile programs may have to fall by the wayside, perhaps only temporarily; but I do stand in strong support of H.R. 2100 and against the Dickinson amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the very distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUNDERSON].

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Chairman, no decisions are easy when you have the budget constraints that are in front of this Congress at this point in time. I would suggest that the Reagan defense authorization bill fits that category; but I think there are a couple basic questions that we need to ask ourselves here this morning.

Never has there been a time in recent memory when the credibility of the Secretary of Defense, when the credibility of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff has been higher, and probably never has there been a time in recent memory when their advice on a defense authorization bill has been disregarded more than it has in the proposal that is now in front of the House of Representatives.

It is for that reason that I encourage my colleagues to take a good hard look at the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] because it begins to recognize that we are only part of the process and the experts who carried out the war and the experts who more importantly are planning for the future military activities should they become necessary suggest that we need a better combination than we have in the committee bill that is in front of us.

I think Secretary Cheney was absolutely right when he said that it is fair of the Congress to ask Defense over the next 5 years to take a hundred billion dollar cut, and they will do that. It is fair over the next 5 years to ask the Pentagon to take a 25-percent cut in troops, and they will do that; but there has to be some point in this process where we allow the day-to-day managers, the military experts, to have some input into those decisions.

The substitute that is before us at this time has the same savings that the committee bill does. It spends the same alternatively as well.

The substitute is going to deal with the same difficult personnel decisions that the bill does, but it makes some very basic and important differences.

It says that we will within this allocated amount of money establish the priorities that worked in Desert Storm that are supported by the American

people. That means that we will deal with technology and make a commitment to have smart weapons for the 21st century, as well as for 1991, and that we will deal with manpower in a fair and equitable way. That is why the substitute offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] is important for this Congress to pass, to offer its support so that as this committee goes into negotiations with the Senate we go in with an honest Defense bill supported by or at least including the administration's perspectives.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SISISKY].

Mr. SISISKY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

You know, I read an editorial this morning that characterized me by name, and I felt this would be a good place to do it, of being bought by the chairman of the committee. It is amazing. I got bought for \$11.3 million to vote with the Committee. I was bought for finance building.

I want to tell you what it was. It was an accreditation to a hospital that would receive veterans who come back at Fort Lee, VA.

The reason I bring this up is that all these things seem to slip through faceless wonders at the Pentagon. Are they my age? I doubt it. Do they have any experience? I doubt it.

I go to meetings. I am in Congress to make decisions. Are they always right? No, they are not always right.

Somebody made the statement, "What have we learned from Desert Storm?"

□ 1130

The Pentagon learned a lot but we learned something too. Do you remember that this Congress said that we need fast sealift and we appropriated \$1.3 billion and nobody in the Pentagon spent it? We knew we needed it. We did not need a Desert Storm to tell us that. And we are not cognizant of stealth? If my memory serves me right we are redoing all of the F-117A's. If my memory serves me right we are doing ATF; we are doing AX. They are certainly stealth.

This Member, without the chairman of the committee making a deal, will make a decision that he is not willing to vote for another bomber that we do not ultimately know the price of and the ultimate reason to have it.

The Stealth bomber of this decade is the B-1. It does not work. This Member is not going to embarrass himself if the B-2 does not work.

I think that this budget adequately protects the United States. Would I like to see more? You bet your life I would like to see more. We are deficient in many areas that the Pentagon allows. We argued on one of them just yesterday. But that is no reason to



vote against this budget. And do not forget, my colleagues, that game is not over; we have got to go to the other body yet. I would say that this budget that we presented is the right budget or at least as good as or better than the budget being presented now.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN], who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Military Installations and Facilities.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, if someone were to come through our Chamber and listen to the debate you would think that a couple of years ago President Bush and Dick Cheney got up one morning and said, "I think a great idea would be to cut the defense budget so that after 5 years we would be spending less a percentage of our gross national product on defense than at any time prior to 1939." Remember 1939, that is when we were getting our Army together and they were running around the farm houses in northern New York with broomsticks, getting ready to go over to Europe, and the Pacific to fight the Axis forces.

It was not President Bush's idea. This is a function of the budget agreement we had 2 years ago.

Now as we are cutting down our uniformed personnel by 500,000 over the course of the next 5 years the bill before us says, "Wait a minute, you can do that but for whatever reason you cannot do an equal or similar reduction in the Guard and Reserve."

Now I understand that that would probably make for pretty good politics back home, but I am afraid in trying to defend this Nation and avoid woes in the next decade and decades ahead that that is not the smart thing to do. Truly the Michel substitute is not perfect, I would agree with that; you all know in your heart of hearts that the committee bill is not right. I think we all hope, at least those who understand the object of this exercise ought to be providing for our Nation's defense, that somehow a rational bill is going to be put together in conference.

I do not necessarily have the confidence that others do in the other body to do the right thing but I would hope in conference, no matter what happens here, we would come up with a bill that speaks of defense rather than political interests.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON].

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation, I have to rise in opposition to the gentleman from Alabama's substitute. There is no question that this committee has made several important improvements to the military personnel portion of the Cheney budget. First earlier this year Congress enacted a

landmark piece of legislation, the Persian Gulf Personnel Benefits Act of 1991. We are very proud of that effort and the committee-reported bill continues the momentum of that personnel benefits legislation by making the various benefit increases permanent: increase in imminent danger pay, increase in family separation allowances, increase in the death gratuity.

In addition, in order not to reinvent the wheel during a future Operation Desert Storm the committee has made the package of personnel benefits permanent with authority for the Secretary of Defense to trigger them for future contingency operations.

Let me emphasize to our colleagues that the Cheney budget did not contain this package. The gentleman from Wisconsin said the same personnel issues were in both packages; wrong. The President's budget proposed disproportionate, large front-loaded cuts in the Selected Reserve end strength. It would result in the inactivation of a large number of Army Reserve and National Guard units across this country.

Many of my House colleagues have contacted me to indicate their concern about this, asked me, "What am I going to do about the impact on my district," with the reduction in the Reserve and the Guard?

The Cheney budget would reduce the Selected Reserve end strength by 9 percent in a single fiscal year, 1992.

Mr. Chairman, as we draw down our Active Force over the new few years it is important to have positions available in Guard and Reserve units in order to access that pool of highly trained and experienced manpower that we have seen in Desert Storm.

The more modest Selected Reserve cuts in the committee-approved bill will insure that we have spaces available in Reserve and Guard units for those separating voluntarily, or, importantly, involuntarily from the Active Forces.

The committee has devoted an enormous amount of time and attention to making that a doable process.

H.R. 2100 as reported does this. I urge my colleagues to reject the Dickinson substitute/Michel amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am chairman of Subcommittee on Seapower and Strategic and Critical Materials. And as I look at the bill coming from Secretary Cheney and the bill that is brought up by the committee, I note that everything that Secretary Cheney asked for he got out of the Seapower Subcommittee, everything. But in addition to that a lot of other things were done which are helpful to our national defense from the standpoint of the Navy.

In addition long-lead funds would be provided for *Seawolf*-class attack sub-

marines, *Arleigh Burke*-class guided missile destroyers, air cushion landing craft, very important parts of our Navy.

In addition to items contained in the Cheney budget the committee recommendations would provide for a number of improvements to ships presently under construction or in operation that were not included in the Cheney budget. For instance, improvements including fire safety for the Trident submarine. They were going to leave out the \$6 million necessary for fire protection in that new submarine. Our committee insisted they put it in.

In addition to these improvements of fire safety, there were things like Outlaw Bandit capability for surface combatants, the Sidekick active electronic countermeasure systems for surface ships, Block I performance improvements for deployed close-in weapon systems, procurement of additional rolling airframe missile launchers for our amphibious ships that would not be provided this capability list in the Cheney budget.

In summary and I want to say something else before I quit because I have the time and I want to say it. In summary, from the standpoint of the Seapower Subcommittee, the committee bill is an improvement in every way, every positive way with regard to having a strong Navy. Regrettably it is too small. But if there is anything parochial in the entire picture that we have today before us, it is the new homeports. Imagine when you are planning for a 600-ship Navy, they said you needed some new homeports. Now we are bringing it down from a 600-ship Navy to a 400-ship Navy, perhaps a 350-ship Navy and some people say a 300-ship Navy, and we are still going to have these new home ports. There is nothing more parochial in this bill than the new home ports. Absolutely parochial as I see it. We do not need it, it should not be done.

Now I would like to say some other things from my heart: I have heard some remarks here on the floor and I have been here most of this debate, but you would think if you listened to it on TV that somehow or another everybody on this side of the aisle had voted against all these things that Schwarzkopf and Colin Powell said were so wonderful. They said it was tremendous. They did not say they suddenly got all these people drilled in a half hour before the thing took place or they found all these weapons just before. They said these weapons that had been produced were from the past, they were wonderful, they were great.

□ 1140

Who produced them? Our Government produced them, Democrats and Republicans alike. Do you think the Democrats opposed these programs?

They are very much for these programs.

Things have been printed indicating the Democrats are opposed to the Patriot. There is no foundation for that at all. Democrats vigorously support and supported the Patriot. Other things that are said like that on the floor, which are distressing to me, divisive to our country, making it look like there are a bunch of traitors on one side of the aisle and a bunch of people better than anybody else on the other side of the aisle. The truth is, this Congress put this together and has put it together over a period of years, and most of these years were Democratic years.

I oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON]. The Armed Services Committee has, in my view, fashioned a bill that better addresses the defense needs of our country than the Cheney budget which was modified during the committee deliberations.

In matters under the jurisdiction of the Seapower Subcommittee, the committee recommendations provide for a stronger Navy than the Cheney budget. The committee recommendations would provide for the new ships contained in the Cheney budget, including one *Seawolf*-class attack submarine, five *Arleigh Burke*-class guided missile destroyers, one landing ship dock, two coastal minehunters, one fast combat support ship, two auxiliary oceanographic research ships, and 12 air cushion landing craft. In addition long lead funds would be provided for *Seawolf*-class attack submarines, *Arleigh Burke*-class guided missile destroyers, and air cushion landing craft.

In addition to items contained in the Cheney budget the committee recommendations would provide for a number of improvements to ships presently under construction or in operation that were not included in the Cheney budget. These improvements include improved fire safety for the Trident submarine authorized last year, procurement of additional Outlaw Bandit capability for surface combatants, Sidekick active electronic countermeasure systems for surface ships, block 1 performance improvements for deployed close in weapon systems, procurement of additional rolling airframe missile launchers for amphibious ships that would not be provided this capability under the Cheney budget, and improved radars for aircraft carriers.

In summary, the committee recommendations provide for a stronger Navy and deserve the support of the House. Vote "no" on the Dickinson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] has 4 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP].

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I rise in strong support of the Michel amendment. I do have some reservations about what we are doing to the Guard and Reserve, but overall it is a much better approach than H.R. 2100.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the ranking member of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP], he has always been a staunch supporter and very cognizant of the needs of our country, and I appreciate his words.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. Spence. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, even though I voted for this authorization, the Cheney substitute is not entirely to my liking.

I am not opposed to the administration's defense goals. But I'm uneasy with a plan that takes down our forces too much, too fast.

I am uneasy when I see what is coming: Defense spending sinking to its lowest level in 50 years; 81 weapons programs wiped out; aircraft production lines shutdown; fewer soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines; fewer guardsmen and reservists to back them up; fewer Army divisions, fighter wings, ships, submarines, and aircraft carriers; and delays in space-based defenses.

Think about that, and then ask yourself: Is that what Americans want to spend on defense?

Perhaps I'm being too cautious. After all, tight budgets are forcing cuts that could pay big technological dividends down the road. Some say we can afford a procurement holiday. Others are convinced that even with a scaled-down military, we can field a potent force. All that sounds nice and neat, but it's all based on rosy assumptions.

In short, we're gambling that everything goes fairly well in the world until we build the next generation of advanced weapons. That's at least 10 years away.

So what if another Desert Storm comes along? Experts tell us we won't have the muscle for another all-out effort. Worse yet, could we fight and defeat smarter and stronger forces in a major war, on many fronts, with a force cut 25 percent? Will future aggressors wait patiently while we build up our forces?

At this point, I think Americans are being lulled into believing that sound preparedness comes with a smaller price tag. Future conflicts and wars can't be fought on that premise. That just shows a shallow resolve to potential adversaries.

For this country to stay a superpower, protecting freedom around the world, then it must have the means to project power.

Right now, the committee bill cuts back to much, too fast. The Cheney substitute does, too, but is overall, a better approach.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the very distinguished minority leader, our Republican leader, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] is recognized for 6½ minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I am most honored to be the cosponsor with Mr. DICKINSON of what we would like to call the Cheney-Powell amendment to the defense authorization bill. May I first, at the very outset, compliment all those Members on both sides of the aisle who devote so much time to the defense needs of our country, and particularly this morning to those on my side who so eloquently spoke in support of our substitute.

I guess to put this debate in proper perspective, let me begin my remarks by quoting the first paragraph of the letter written to me by President Bush.

The full text of the two letters referred to by myself and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, DC, May 20, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Republican Leader, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1992 and 1993 (H.R. 2100) as reported by the House Armed Services Committee fails to meet the needs of the Nation's defense. If I am presented the bill reported by the Committee, I will veto it.

With the changes in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, and with the limitations on resources available for national defense, we plan substantial reductions in the coming years in the size of the U.S. armed forces. To provide forces capable of meeting future challenges within the fiscal limits that American taxpayers can afford, we must spend funds available for national defense with maximum efficiency. There is no room for pork-barrel spending or politics as usual in Congress.

The bill reported by the Committee terminated the B-2 Stealth bomber program that is vital to our defense in the next century. Also, despite the increasing need for effective defenses against missile attacks, the Committee bill slashes funding for the Strategic Defense Initiative, and especially the important Brilliant Pebbles program. While cutting funding for these and other crucial programs, the bill funds unneeded items such as excessive procurement of aircraft and other weapons systems. Finally, the bill prevents the reduction in the size of the Reserve and National Guard components of the armed forces needed for a carefully balanced and effective force structure.

The bipartisan leadership of the Congress and I have agreed to limits on the amounts which we will spend in the next few years on defense. We must spend these funds wisely if we are to provide the American people with the armed forces needed to defend the Nation and its interests around the globe. I urge the House of Representatives to produce a bill that reflects America's real defense needs, in lieu of the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Similar letters have been sent to the Speaker and Congressmen Aspin and Dickinson.

Sincerely,

GEORGE BUSH.



CHAIRMAN OF THE  
JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF,  
Washington, DC, May 20, 1991.

Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,  
Minority Leader of the House, House of Rep-  
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. MICHEL: I am writing to provide my full support to the President's defense program for FY 92 and 93 which Secretary Cheney and I and all members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff have been supporting in testimony.

I want to assure the members of Congress that the President's program is a very carefully balanced program; one that is responsive to the changing geopolitical situation; one that is fiscally responsible; and one that is consistent with last year's budget summit agreement.

It was not easy putting this program together. Many tradeoffs were made; many programs were eliminated; and the force structure was reduced to insure that it could be fully supported and maintained. The resulting Base Force, as we call it, is the minimum force needed in each service to execute current national security policy and to protect our Nation's interests around the world. It is a finely tuned force and significant changes in the budget request will unbalance the Base Force.

I am deeply concerned that some of the actions being considered by the House would upset that fine balance. For that reason, I strongly reaffirm my support and the support of the JCS for the President's program as submitted and for the Michel-Dickinson Amendment to the House authorization bill which reaffirms the President's program.

Sincerely,

COLIN L. POWELL,  
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The President said:

The National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 1992 and 1993 (H.R. 2100) as reported by the House Armed Services Committee fails to meet the needs of the Nation's defense. If I am presented the bill reported by the committee, I will veto it.

Now, those nine simple words, "fails to meet the needs of the Nation's defense," deserve our attention, because they come from a great leader who gave us a victory in the gulf. When it comes to defense policy, President Bush has certainly earned the benefit of a doubt. And the President does have grave doubts about significant portions of this committee bill.

Like the legendary pudding immortalized by Winston Churchill, the majority's defense policy lacks a theme. The Cheney-Powell amendment, on the other hand, is comprehensive. It is coherent, and it is fashioned around a theme, an overall theme.

It takes into account not only the threat that we face today but the problems that we might face tomorrow. The Cheney-Powell budget approach reflects the kind of defense leadership that has proven itself as a winning combination, and that is what a defense bill should be all about, its seems to me.

Are we going to deny them what they need? Are we going to say, sure, you did well in the desert but what have you done for us lately?

Mr. Chairman, I have said it before: in almost every war, the United States goes through the same old pattern. In time of war there is unity. In victory, we experience great euphoria. And then after the victory, amnesia sets in.

The committee bill and some of the isolationist burden-sharing amendments that are going to be offered following the amendment suggest some of us are even now suffering from a collective amnesia attack. Have we not learned our lesson? Have we not learned the world is not a big sensitivity training session where we can wish away evil by repeating politically correct clichés?

We are told the strategic defense initiative and the B-2 cost too much. But the right weapons never cost too much. It is defeat that costs too much. It is needless deaths in battle that are expensive, and it is an American population totally defenseless against nuclear missile attack that is too dear.

Remember, what we did to the Iraqi Army can be done to our forces if somebody else gains the technological edge tomorrow. Stealth bombers and SDI are the maximum deterrents of the future.

Members of the Armed Services Committee are patriotic, dedicated, knowledgeable men and women each and every one of them. But the very structure of this institution, fragmented, individualistic, parochial, makes it difficult for us to provide a central, unified vision of national defense.

I find myself in the same boat. If we were a junior Member of Congress, I would be out there plugging more on the Reserve forces because that is my only parochial interest at home. That is the only thing we have got. But I am a leader. I have to take a little bit different approach. I have to put myself above that parochial interest, hopefully to speak in the national interest as I do today.

We should ask ourselves that one question that is really essential here. I pray it does not happen, but suppose years from now a Member of my colleagues' or my family has to go to war for our national interest again? Will my colleagues want the Armed Forces in which he or she serves forged by the vision of warriors or jerry built by the tradeoffs of a committee? Do the men and women of our Armed Forces deserve the defense budget presented by the President or do they deserve a defense budget the President says fails to meet the needs of the Nation's defense, an indictment all the more damning for its quiet understatement?

Within the past 10 days or so we have heard General Schwarzkopf, and Queen Elizabeth speak from the dias of this House to a joint session of the Congress, extolling the virtues of our President, our Secretary of Defense, our military leadership, and all our

Armed Forces for a job well done in the Persian Gulf war.

Why then would we, as Congress, and particularly Members on my side of the aisle, not want to support the recommendations of our proven leadership team? Let us give the Cheneys and Powells and the American warriors of the future the kind of military they will need to fight or deter the battles of tomorrow.

Obviously, I urge my colleagues to support the substitute that we are offering here this morning.

MR. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dickinson substitute.

Mr. Chairman, this represents the same tired cold war policies of the last decade. The substitute appears drafted in blissful ignorance of the elimination of the Warsaw Pact, the sharp decline in Soviet power, and the fall of the Berlin Wall. Rather than reciting a catalog of each and everything wrong with this substitute, I will concentrate on two issues: women in combat positions and Crotona.

The Committee on Armed Services surprised itself by voting overwhelmingly for the Byron amendment and for my amendment to eliminate the statutory restriction on women in combat aircraft in the Navy and the Air Force. Following the superb performance of female soldiers in the Persian Gulf, the committee decided it was time to permit women to pursue every job for which the woman had the physical and intellectual qualifications in the military. Sex discrimination can no longer be justified in the military.

A vote for the Dickinson substitute would restore the statutory exclusion from women in combat aircraft. A vote for Dickinson is a vote to maintain sex discrimination in the military.

The committee also voted to prohibit the expenditure of United States money to build a new base at Crotona, Italy. The administration wants to spend \$360 million of United States money to build a brand new airbase at Crotona to base the aircraft being kicked out of Torrejon, Spain. The House spoke loudly and twice last year to block all spending on Crotona. In April, Secretary Cheney proposed that 15 airbases in the United States be closed. I cannot explain to my constituents why we should spend money to build a new base in Italy, while closing a base in Colorado.

The Dickinson substitute would give the green light to building the new base at Crotona. Rather than fighting this issue directly, as I expected, Mr. DICKINSON would give the go-ahead for Crotona as part of his substitute.

There are plenty of other good reasons to oppose Dickinson: B-2, SDI, Guard and Reserve personnel levels, DBOF. I urge its rejection.

MR. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I am honored to be the clean-up hitter in opposition to the Michel-Dickinson-Cheney amendment. Let me point out to Mr. MICHEL, just as to what he said, that there is a lot of talent on the Armed Services Committee. Some of us have been here longer than most service members serving in the Defense Department. So I certainly feel that we do have some abilities on the committee. We have experience. We have a cross-section of Americans on that committee, and we feel like we have done a good job.

Ninety-five percent of what President Bush wanted in his defense bill is given to him. I think we are entitled to make some changes. I would like to point out that I am very concerned about the drastic changes this amendment makes from the committee bill to the National Guard and Reserve.

The Dickinson budget would reduce the number of Army National Guardsmen and reservists by approximately 30 percent over a 4-year period, reduce the Guard and Reserve by 30 percent.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, about one in every three Army Guardsman and reservist would have to be discharged, even though many have just returned from the Persian Gulf. Also if we adopt this amendment, one out of every three National Guard and Reserve armories would have to be closed in Members' communities because of the Dickinson budget.

□ 1150

In the committee bill, we reduce the end strength of the Guard and Reserve, but not nearly what the Army wanted.

Mr. Chairman, it is ironic that the other services did not ask for the drastic cuts in their reserves that the Army did.

Listen to this, and it will shock you. The Army asked for 10.6 percent reduction in end strength for the National Guard and Reserve in this next fiscal year. Yet they would reduce the active Army strength by only 7 percent.

Every State will be hit, but with the reduction under the Dickinson proposal, the States that would be really hit hardest would be New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Texas, California, Alabama, Florida, and Wisconsin. Now, that is just the first installment.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, that may have been because the Army was concerned with the length of time it took to prepare the round out brigades for Desert Shield and Desert Storm. The active duty forces performed very admirably, as did many National Guard units, but the round out brigades raised some concerns. It seems to me that

some reductions in both the active and reserve components will have to be part of the budget adjustments. We can debate the right mix and the rate of the reductions in each component but I don't think it is advisable to limit cuts to just one side of the total force.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time. The combat units of the National Guard were outstanding, as were the artillery units from Oklahoma, Arkansas, West Virginia, and Tennessee. There were some problems with the round out brigades, because they should have been manned out with the divisions they were assigned to. The Defense Department made a serious mistake in not calling the brigades up in August.

Mr. DICKS. If the gentleman will yield further, I did in fact read very much about how long it took to activate the round out brigades.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. We will certainly take a look in our committee, on round out brigades but the Defense Department is going to have to do a better job of using the total force as far as Army is concerned. The other services did a splendid job in implementing the total force.

A National Guard or Reserve unit in a community is certainly an economic boost. The best way to spread around defense spending is to have National Guard and Reserve units in our different communities, where those reservists can receive additional income, educational benefits, and serve his or her country.

General Schwarzkopf said in this chamber:

The National Guard and Reserve were magnificent in the Persian Gulf War.

So really it does not make any sense at this time to adopt the Dickinson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the committee bill recommends \$650 million for equipment for the Guard and Reserve. Under the amendment, not much new hardware will go to the Reserve components, and the \$650 million will be taken out.

In the past 10 years this Congress has really helped the Guard and Reserve, giving them new equipment. Before that, all we got was hand me downs.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL] thinks that the committee should not have much input into the defense bill. I mentioned that when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] made his remarks.

Really, the President got 95 percent of what he wanted. Surely our Committee on Armed Services is entitled to make some changes. But the Dickinson amendment eliminates the work of the subcommittees and the full committee. Certainly this House realizes the Committee on Armed Services deserves some input.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the Dickinson amendment. Let us save the National Guard and Reserve.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my support for the Michel amendment to H.R. 2100, which would restore the Secretary of Defense's original request for funding for our military.

It is clear that the committee bill makes serious adjustments in Secretary of Defense Cheney's desire to emphasize a balanced, high-quality operational force. The Secretary of Defense has made clear that he would urge the President to veto the bill which the committee has reported. Among other things, the committee bill seeks to extend a number of current procurement programs that the Secretary wishes to terminate.

In noting my reservations about the committee-reported bill, I would want to make clear my continuing and unequivocal support for the V-22 Osprey tiltrotor program. In my judgment, this is a vital program that is supported in both the House and the other body. Regardless of the outcome of the vote on the Michel amendment, it is clear to me that this exceptional program will be preserved in the conference report on the defense authorization bill, as it should be.

Mr. SLATTERY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Michel substitute to H.R. 2100, the fiscal year 1992 defense authorization bill. The Michel substitute would reinstate the Pentagon's original fiscal year 1992 budget request.

I am opposed, above all, to the \$3.2 billion included in the Michel substitute to procure four additional B-2 Stealth bombers in fiscal year 1992, and advance procurement for 7 more. I have worked very hard over the past 16 months to terminate further production funds for the B-2. The B-2, now projected to cost \$865 million per copy, is a plane we neither need nor can afford.

H.R. 2100, as reported by the House Armed Services Committee, recognizes that stealthy aircraft are important to this Nation's defense, but directs the money much more reasonably: to the F-117A, which proved itself in the Persian Gulf war; to the advanced tactical fighter, which has been the subject of an intense and rigorous competition between defense contractors; and the advanced cruise missile. In addition, the committee bill retains \$1.6 billion for research and development of the B-2, in order to test fully the 15 aircraft which we have already purchased.

The Michel substitute also would provide an outrageous 80-percent increase over last year's funding level for the strategic defense initiative. It provides \$1.6 billion for Brilliant Pebbles, a program to put 1,000 warhead-killing rockets in space. Deployment of Brilliant Pebbles would abrogate the ABM Treaty and realistically could not stop a massive nuclear attack by the Soviet Union. The Michel substitute would take responsibility and funding for tactical missile defenses away from the Army, which handled the Patriot program so capably, and give it to the strategic defense initiative organization, which has already frittered away \$24 billion with virtually nothing to show for it. The Michel substitute would cut the account for ground-based limited defenses of the United States 20 percent from the committee bill.

Finally, the Michel substitute would gut the National Guard and Reserves. The Persian



Gulf war proved that Guard and Reserve units are invaluable for providing the logistical support required in modern warfare; support units outnumbered combat units 2 to 1 in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. It does not make sense to cut Guard and Reserve units at the same rate as active duty troops, because Guard and Reserve units are a much better bargain: paid part-time to train, but ready when needed for a crisis. The Michel substitute also would eliminate \$650 million provided in the committee bill for modernization of Guard equipment. It is crucial that the Guard and Reserves train with modern equipment, so that they will be ready to use it in case of war.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the Michel substitute, and support the committee bill.

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Dickinson amendment to replace the Armed Services Committee reported bill with the President's defense budget. The President's defense program is a comprehensive plan to address the changing world situation, while recognizing the remaining strategic threat, but without continuing down the dangerous path of unilateral disarmament.

The liberal oriented plan offered by the House Armed Services Committee leaves the strategic defense initiative in shambles and terminates the B-2 Program with only 15 airplanes. Congress should not follow the lead of those who were unwilling to support the President in the Persian Gulf. How can they claim to be incorporating lessons learned from the gulf conflict when the big lesson is that we should reject the liberal approach to reducing defense spending.

Mr. Chairman, the President's budget builds on the success of the conflict to liberate Kuwait. I hope Members will give it their support despite areas of disagreement which inevitably arise in the legislative process. I am particularly concerned with the rapidity of the drawdown of National Guard and Reserve forces in the President's budget. Historically, it has been very difficult to adequately fund the Guard and Reserves. They have consistently lagged behind their active duty counterparts, especially in equipment and training accounts.

I believe we should proceed more cautiously with reductions in the Guard and Reserves than we are with Active Duty Forces, if only in recognition of the perennial battle we have fought to bring them to their current point of readiness. However, I strongly support the President's defense plan as the better way to provide for the defense of American interests.

Mr. MCEWEN. Mr. Chairman, today the House will consider the Cheney budget alternative to the House Armed Services Committee defense budget. It is the responsible defense budget, the defense plan that will maintain our strength while reducing the resources we commit to defense.

The Cheney budget is the one opportunity Members have to support stealth technology and the B-2 bomber. We need the B-2 for two simple reasons: Stealth saves lives and Stealth saves money.

First, American pilots will be protected with the B-2: It will give our future Air Force the ability to carry out the entire range of bombing missions with the fewest pilots in the line of

fire. And those pilots will have the maximum protection—Stealth.

The Persian Gulf was the proving ground for Stealth. It works. On the battlefield it gives a decided advantage to those who have it. The B-2 is the future of the bomber.

Second, cost: Although almost every Member of Congress understands the effectiveness of the B-2, there are many concerns about the cost. The problem is that we are looking at price, not value.

Stealth is so revolutionary that cost comparisons take on new meaning. The B-2 will change the force structure of bombing missions.

Let's be straight about this—Stealth let's longrun costs to go down while combat capability goes up.

We can't throw this away. Stealth saves lives, and Stealth saves money. Support the Cheney budget.

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the substitute amendment because I believe the President's priorities will better secure our national defense in the years ahead.

One of the President's key priorities, and one that tragically has been stripped altogether from the committee bill, is the B-2 Stealth bomber. As the vice chairman of the B-2 Republican support group and a member of the congressional B-2 Stealth caucus, I rise today to support the B-2 bomber. It is indeed tragic that the Congress has not always worked together to support projects that benefit our Nation's defense.

For too long, too many of my colleagues have consistently opposed virtually every weapons advance that our Nation's engineers have devised. I sincerely hope that the outstanding performance of many of those weapons in the Persian Gulf cause some Members to reappraise their views, and that perhaps we can work together to save the B-2.

Besides that fact that the B-2 Program generates a significant number of jobs, I believe the Stealth bomber is crucial to our future national security. The successes of the F-117 against Iraq demonstrated the genius of the Stealth design, and the war also proved that the technology of 20 years ago is simply no match for the technology of today. That trend will continue, and the nation that does not continue moving forward will regret that decision down the road.

I urge my colleagues to reconsider the strategic value of the B-2 to our national security. Stealth saves lives, requires fewer aircraft, and thus less money for the same firepower.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. DURBIN). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 287, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 99]

#### AYES—127

Alexander	Gekas	Moorhead
Allard	Gilchrest	Morrison
Anderson	Gillmor	Nichols
Archer	Gingrich	Packard
Armey	Goss	Paxon
Baker	Grandy	Petri
Ballenger	Gunderson	Porter
Barrett	Hammerschmidt	Ramstad
Bateman	Hancock	Rhodes
Bentley	Hansen	Riggs
Bereuter	Hastert	Ritter
Billakis	Hefley	Roberts
Bliley	Herger	Rohrabacher
Boehrlert	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Boehner	Holloway	Schaefer
Broomfield	Houghton	Schiff
Bunning	Huckaby	Schulze
Burton	Hunter	Shaw
Callahan	Hyde	Shuster
Campbell (CA)	Inhofe	Skeen
Campbell (CO)	Ireland	Slaughter (VA)
Chandler	Johnson (CT)	Smith (OR)
Clinger	Kolbe	Smith (TX)
Coleman (MO)	Kyl	Solomon
Combest	Lagomarsino	Spence
Coughlin	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Cox (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Stump
Crane	Lightfoot	Sundquist
Cunningham	Livingston	Thomas (CA)
Dannemeyer	Lowery (CA)	Thomas (WY)
Davis	Marlenee	Torres
DeLay	Martin	Upton
Dickinson	McCandless	Vander Jagt
Doolittle	McCollum	Vucanovich
Dornan (CA)	McCrery	Walker
Dreier	McDade	Walsh
Duncan	McEwen	Weber
Edwards (OK)	McMillan (NC)	Wolf
Fawell	Meyers	Wylie
Fields	Michel	Young (FL)
Fish	Miller (OH)	Zeliff
Franks (CT)	Miller (WA)	
Galleghy	Molinari	

#### NOES—287

Abercrombie	de la Garza	Hall (TX)
Ackerman	DeLauro	Hamilton
Andrews (ME)	Dellums	Harris
Andrews (NJ)	Derrick	Hatcher
Andrews (TX)	Dicks	Hayes (IL)
Annuizio	Dingell	Hayes (LA)
Applegate	Dixon	Hefner
Aspin	Donnelly	Henry
Atkins	Dooley	Hertel
AuCoin	Dorgan (ND)	Hoagland
Bacchus	Downey	Hochbrueckner
Barnard	Durbin	Horn
Barton	Dwyer	Horton
Beilenson	Dymally	Hoyer
Bennett	Early	Hubbard
Bevill	Eckart	Hughes
Billbray	Edwards (CA)	Hutto
Bonior	Edwards (TX)	Jacobs
Borski	Emerson	James
Boucher	Engel	Jefferson
Boxer	English	Jenkins
Brewster	Erdreich	Johnson (SD)
Brooks	Espy	Johnston
Browder	Evans	Jones (GA)
Brown	Fascell	Jones (NC)
Bruce	Fazio	Jontz
Bryant	Feighan	Kanjorski
Bustamante	Flake	Kaptur
Byron	Foglietta	Kasich
Camp	Ford (MI)	Kennedy
Cardin	Ford (TN)	Kennelly
Carper	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Carr	Frost	Klecza
Chapman	Gallo	Klug
Clay	Gaydos	Kolter
Clement	Gedensson	Kopetski
Coble	Gephardt	Kostmayer
Coleman (TX)	Geren	LaFalce
Collins (IL)	Gibbons	Lancaster
Collins (MI)	Gilman	Lantos
Conyers	Glickman	Laughlin
Cooper	Gonzalez	Leach
Costello	Goodling	Lehman (CA)
Cox (IL)	Gordon	Lent
Coyne	Green	Levin (MI)
Cramer	Guarini	Levine (CA)
Darden	Hall (OH)	Lewis (GA)

Lipinski	Patterson	Skelton
Lloyd	Payne (NJ)	Slattery
Long	Payne (VA)	Slaughter (NY)
Lowey (NY)	Pease	Smith (FL)
Luken	Pelosi	Smith (IA)
Machtley	Penny	Smith (NJ)
Manton	Perkins	Snowe
Markey	Peterson (FL)	Solarz
Martinez	Peterson (MN)	Spratt
Matsui	Pickett	Staggers
Mavroules	Pickle	Stallings
Mazzoli	Poshard	Stark
McCloskey	Price	Stenholm
McCurdy	Pursell	Stokes
McDermott	Quillen	Studds
McGrath	Rahall	Swett
McHugh	Ravenel	Swift
McMillen (MD)	Ray	Synar
McNulty	Reed	Tallon
Mfume	Regula	Tanner
Miller (CA)	Richardson	Tauzin
Mineta	Ridge	Taylor (NC)
Mink	Rinaldo	Thomas (GA)
Mollohan	Roe	Thornton
Montgomery	Roemer	Torricelli
Moody	Rose	Towns
Moran	Rostenkowski	Trafiacant
Morrell	Roukema	Traxler
Mrazek	Rowland	Unsoeld
Murtha	Roybal	Valentine
Myers	Russo	Vento
Nagle	Sabo	Visclosky
Natcher	Sanders	Volkmer
Neal (MA)	Santemister	Washington
Neal (NC)	Santorum	Waters
Nowak	Sarpalius	Waxman
Nussle	Savage	Weiss
Oakar	Sawyer	Weldon
Oberstar	Saxton	Wheat
Obey	Scheuer	Whitten
Olin	Schroeder	Williams
Ortiz	Schumer	Wilson
Orton	Sensenbrenner	Wise
Owens (NY)	Serrano	Wolpe
Owens (UT)	Sharp	Wyden
Oxley	Shays	Yates
Pallone	Sikorski	Yatron
Panetta	Siskisky	Zimmer
Parker	Skaggs	

## NOT VOTING—16

Anthony	Hopkins	Rogers
Berman	LaRocco	Roth
Condit	Lehman (FL)	Taylor (MS)
DeFazio	Moakley	Young (AK)
Gradison	Murphy	
Gray	Rangel	

□ 1213

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Rogers for, with Mr. Moakley against.  
Mr. Roth for, with Mr. Rangel against.

Messrs. BENNETT, HOYER, WAXMAN, PARKER, and AUCOIN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably absent during House rollcall No. 99. I would like the RECORD to reflect that if I had been here, I would have noted "no" on rollcall No. 99, the vote on the Dickinson amendment.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LAROCOCO. Mr. Chairman, as I was unavoidably detained during the vote of Mr. DICKINSON'S substitute Defense bill amendment earlier this afternoon, my vote was not registered. Had I been present I would have been recorded as voting "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall vote No. 99, I was unavoidably detained in my office.

Had I been present, I would have supported the efforts of the committee and voted against the Dickinson amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word in order to explain the schedule.

Mr. Chairman, let me just take a few moments and explain the schedule of what we are going to do here. We are going to rise right here for just a moment because we need to file a conference report on the budget resolution. That will just take a moment.

We will then come back into the Committee of the Whole. When we come back into the Committee of the Whole, the order of the procedure under the defense bill will first be 60 minutes of general debate on burden sharing. Then we will have a series of amendments. There will be 40 minutes of debate, and then a vote on the Schroeder amendment; 40 minutes of debate and a vote on the Frank amendment; 40 minutes of debate and a vote on the Dorgan amendment; 40 minutes of debate and a vote on the Bryant amendment; and then a 10-minute debate and a vote on the Mrazek amendment.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I was wondering if our chairman could give us some indication of whether he believes all of the time will be taken.

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, I believe it will be. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA) having assumed the chair, Mr. DURBIN, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2100) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

# CONFERENCE REPORT ON H. CON. RES. 121, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 1992

Mr. PANETTA submitted the following conference report and statement on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government

for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996.

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 102-69)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121), revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the resolution and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

## SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992.

The Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1992, including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, as required by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990).

## SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$850,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993: \$909,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$966,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,025,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,079,800,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be increased are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$0.

Fiscal year 1993: \$0.

Fiscal year 1994: \$0.

Fiscal year 1995: \$0.

Fiscal year 1996: \$0.

(C) The amounts for Federal Insurance Contributions Act revenues for hospital insurance within the recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$82,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993: \$88,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$94,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$100,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$107,100,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—The appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,269,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993: \$1,272,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,300,800,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,341,700,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,407,400,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—The appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$1,201,600,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993: \$1,212,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$1,234,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$1,209,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$1,276,900,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—The amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$351,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993: \$302,300,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994: \$268,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995: \$183,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996: \$197,100,000,000.



(5) **PUBLIC DEBT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$3,982,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$4,353,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$4,696,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$4,955,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$5,226,600,000,000.

(6) **DIRECT LOAN OBLIGATIONS.**—The appropriate levels of total new direct loan obligations are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$15,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$14,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$15,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$15,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$15,800,000,000.

(7) **PRIMARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.**—The appropriate levels of new primary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$114,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$118,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$121,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$125,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$129,800,000,000.

(8) **SECONDARY LOAN GUARANTEE COMMITMENTS.**—The appropriate levels of new secondary loan guarantee commitments are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$83,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$87,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$90,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$94,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$98,100,000,000.

### SEC. 3. DEBT INCREASE AS A MEASURE OF DEFICIT.

The amounts of the increase in the public debt subject to limitation are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$415,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$371,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$343,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$259,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$270,800,000,000.

### SEC. 4. DISPLAY OF FEDERAL RETIREMENT TRUST FUND BALANCES.

The balances of the Federal retirement trust funds are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$875,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$1,013,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$1,167,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$1,335,900,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$1,517,700,000,000.

### SEC. 5. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) **SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$318,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$341,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$365,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$389,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$415,600,000,000.

(b) **SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of Senate enforcement under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 1992: \$246,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1993: \$257,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1994: \$266,800,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1995: \$276,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 1996: \$284,700,000,000.

### SEC. 6. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, new primary loan guarantee commitments, and new secondary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**  
Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$290,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$295,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$290,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$292,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$289,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$291,300,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$292,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$292,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$300,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$297,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,700,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,000,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,900,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$7,800,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$22,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$2,000,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$8,100,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$500,000,000.

(3) **General Science, Space, and Technology (250):**

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$16,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(4) **Energy (270):**

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,200,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$4,500,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,300,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$400,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,700,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,400,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$200,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,800,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$1,500,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(5) **Natural Resources and Environment (300):**

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,500,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,400,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.





(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,800,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$19,700,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$20,500,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$800,000,000.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$21,300,000,000.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$13,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$13,600,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1994:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,100,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,000,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1995:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,300,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$14,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1996:

(A) New budget authority, \$14,700,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$15,100,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 1992:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,600,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,200,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

Fiscal year 1993:

(A) New budget authority, \$11,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$12,900,000,000.

(C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

(D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

(E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,300,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$11,700,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$12,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$12,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## (18) Net Interest (900):

## Fiscal year 1992:

- (A) New budget authority, \$235,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$235,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1993:

- (A) New budget authority, \$253,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$253,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$268,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$268,800,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$280,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$280,400,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$292,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$292,500,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## (19) The corresponding levels of gross interest on the public debt are as follows:

- Fiscal year 1992: \$312,800,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1993: \$337,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1994: \$357,000,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1995: \$369,900,000,000.
- Fiscal year 1996: \$380,700,000,000.

## (20) Allowances (920):

## Fiscal year 1992:

- (A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$13,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1993:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,500,000,000.

## (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.

## (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,700,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## (21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

## Fiscal year 1992:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,100,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1993:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,200,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1994:

- (A) New budget authority, \$33,900,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$33,900,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1995:

- (A) New budget authority, \$34,500,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$34,500,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## Fiscal year 1996:

- (A) New budget authority, \$35,000,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$35,000,000,000.
- (C) New direct loan obligations, \$0.
- (D) New primary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.
- (E) New secondary loan guarantee commitments, \$0.

## SEC. 7. SALE OF GOVERNMENT ASSETS

## (a) SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

- (1) from time to time the United States Government should sell assets to nongovernment buyers; and
- (2) the amounts realized from such asset sales will not recur on an annual basis and do not reduce the demand for credit.

## (b) BUDGETARY TREATMENT.—For purposes of allocations and points of order under sections 302, 311, 601, 602, and 605 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, the amounts realized from asset sales or prepay-

ments of loans shall not be allocated to a committee and shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues under section 302, 311, 601, 602, 604, or 605 of that Act.

## (c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms "asset sale" and "prepayment of a loan" shall have the same meaning as under section 250(c)(21) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990); and

(2) the terms "asset sale" and "prepayment of a loan" do not include asset sales mandated by law before September 18, 1987, and routine, ongoing asset sales and loan prepayments at levels consistent with agency operations in fiscal year 1986.

## SEC. 8. ACCOUNTING TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.

(a) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in section 5 of this concurrent resolution on the budget are consistent with the assumption that if the Congress adopts legislation to provide for a more gradual period of transition to the changes in benefit computation rules enacted in the Social Security amendments of 1977 as such changes apply to workers born in years after 1916 and before 1927 (and related beneficiaries), or any other legislation affecting these levels in section 5, that such legislation shall include other changes to Social Security outlays and revenues to ensure that the annual Social Security surpluses that accrue to the Social Security Trust Fund are not reduced.

(b) ACCOUNTING TREATMENT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, for the purpose of allocations and points of order under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the levels of Social Security outlays and revenues for this resolution shall be the baseline levels.

## (c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms "Social Security revenues" and "Social Security outlays" shall have the same meaning as under title III of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974; and

(2) no provision of any bill or resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, involving a change in chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be treated as affecting the amount of Social Security revenues unless such provision changes the income tax treatment of Social Security benefits.

## SEC. 9. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FAMILY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY INITIATIVES IN ACCORDANCE WITH PROVISIONS OF THE SUMMIT AGREEMENT.

(a) INITIATIVES TO IMPROVE THE HEALTH AND NUTRITION OF CHILDREN AND TO PROVIDE FOR SERVICES TO PROTECT CHILDREN AND STRENGTHEN FAMILIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to improve the health and nutrition of children and to provide for services to protect children and strengthen families within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) in this resolution for fiscal year 1992, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1992 through 1996.

(2) REVISED ALLOCATIONS.—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1),



and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) to carry out this subsection.

(b) **ECONOMIC RECOVERY INITIATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding for economic recovery initiatives for unemployment compensation or other, related programs within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) in this resolution for fiscal year 1992, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1992 through 1996.

(2) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to section 302(b) and 602(b) to carry out this subsection.

(c) **CONTINUING IMPROVEMENTS IN ONGOING HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS AND PHASING-IN OF HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR ALL AMERICANS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding to make continuing improvements in ongoing health care programs or to begin phasing-in health insurance coverage for all Americans within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) in this resolution for fiscal year 1992, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1992 through 1996.

(2) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional lev-

els, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) to carry out this subsection.

(d) **EXPAND ACCESS TO EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT SERVICES FOR LOW-INCOME PRESCHOOLERS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for direct spending legislation that increases funding to expand access to early childhood development services for low-income preschoolers within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) in this resolution for fiscal year 1992, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1992 through 1996.

(2) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) to carry out this subsection.

(e) **TO FUND SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees for legislation that increases funding for surface transportation within such a committee's jurisdiction if such a committee or the committee of conference on such legislation reports such legislation, if, to the extent that the costs of such legislation are not included in this concurrent resolution on the budget, the enactment of such legislation will not increase the deficit (by virtue of either contemporaneous or previously passed deficit reduction) in this resolution for fiscal year 1992, and will not increase the total deficit for the period of fiscal years 1992 through 1996.

(2) **REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—Upon the reporting of legislation pursuant to paragraph (1), and again upon the submission of a conference report on such legislation (if a conference report is submitted), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) and revised functional levels, and aggregates to carry out this subsection. Such revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution on the budget.

(3) **REPORTING REVISED ALLOCATIONS.**—The appropriate committee may report appropriately revised allocations pursuant to sections 302(b) and 602(b) to carry out this subsection.

**SEC. 10. SENSE OF THE SENATE IN SUPPORT OF CHILDREN AND THE FAMILY.**

It is the sense of the Senate that if a surtax on the income of millionaires is enacted, then the revenue generated by such a surtax will be used to offset a commensurate increase in direct tax assistance to families, which will include increasing dependent exemptions and tax credits for children.

**SEC. 11. VETERANS' PROGRAMS.**

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) veterans' programs are a top national priority and that there are critical needs, particularly in the area of veterans medical care which must be addressed; and

(2) the Committees on Appropriations should, while acting within the limits of the discretionary caps, give maximum consideration to veterans' benefit programs.

**SEC. 12. REVISED FISCAL YEAR 1991 AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS IN THE HOUSE.**

(a) **GENERAL AUTHORITY.**—To ensure that enforcement of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the House of Representatives is consistent with the discretionary caps and pay-as-you-go provisions of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may submit to the House revised budget aggregates for fiscal year 1991 and revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 1991.

(b) **BUDGET AGGREGATES AND ALLOCATIONS.**—Revised budget aggregates and revised allocations submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall be considered, in the House, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 only, as budget aggregates and allocations contained in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1991.

(c) **EFFECT ON SUBDIVISIONS AND THE CONSIDERATION OF MEASURES.**—If the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives submits to the House revised budget aggregates and allocations for fiscal year 1991 pursuant to subsection (a)—

(1) committees of the House shall not be required to file subdivisions of such allocations under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) in the House, with respect to measures providing new budget authority, new entitlement authority, or new credit authority for fiscal year 1991—

(A) section 302(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply; and

(B) the references in sections 302(f) and 401(b)(2) to allocations pursuant to section 302(b) shall be deemed to be references to the revised allocations under section 302(a) as filed by the Chairman.

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the resolution.

LEON E. PANETTA,  
RICHARD GEPHARDT,  
JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
FRANK J. GUARINI,  
DICK DURBIN,  
MIKE ESPY,  
DALE E. KILDEE,  
ANTHONY C. BEILSON,  
JERRY HUCKABY,  
MARTIN OLAV SABO,

Managers on the Part of the House.

JIM SASSER,  
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
DON RIEGLE,  
PAUL SIMON,  
WYCHE FOWLER,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF  
THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the Senate and the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for the fiscal years 1992,

1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment to the text of the resolution struck out all of the House resolution after the resolving clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment which is a substitute for the House resolution and the Senate amendment.

## EXPLANATION OF CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The following tables show the functional allocations and budget aggregates included in the conference agreement over 5 years. In addition, a table follows that breaks out credit amounts by function.

## CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON 1992 RESOLUTION, BY FUNCTION

[Dollars in billions]

Function	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
050 National defense:					
Budget authority	290.8	290.9	289.1	292.0	300.6
Outlays	295.3	292.0	291.3	292.2	297.7
150 International affairs:					
Budget authority	21.9	22.0	21.4	21.6	22.3
Outlays	17.9	18.1	19.1	19.7	20.9
250 Space, science and technology:					
Budget authority	17.1	17.8	17.5	17.7	18.2
Outlays	16.5	17.1	16.8	17.1	18.1
270 Energy:					
Budget authority	6.2	7.1	7.3	6.8	6.7
Outlays	4.5	5.7	5.8	5.0	5.0
300 Natural resources:					
Budget authority	19.5	20.5	20.2	20.4	20.9
Outlays	19.4	20.1	19.8	20.2	21.4
350 Agriculture:					
Budget authority	22.4	19.1	17.1	17.8	13.8
Outlays	17.0	15.6	14.1	13.1	12.5
370 Commerce, housing credit:					
Budget authority	105.9	57.5	38.5	20.5	17.7
Outlays	104.9	53.8	30.1	-42.1	-38.4
400 Transportation:					
Budget authority	34.6	37.8	39.9	42.3	45.3
Outlays	33.7	35.3	34.7	35.2	37.7
450 Community, regional development:					
Budget authority	6.1	6.3	6.2	6.3	6.5
Outlays	6.7	6.4	6.0	6.1	6.2
500 Education:					
Budget authority	53.1	52.6	51.4	51.8	53.4
Outlays	47.9	50.6	49.0	49.2	47.5
550 Health:					
Budget authority	81.1	93.0	102.1	112.2	124.5
Outlays	83.3	92.7	100.9	110.9	123.7
570 Medicare:					
Budget authority	120.1	131.5	145.5	161.8	180.9
Outlays	116.9	128.3	141.9	157.4	176.4
600 Income security:					
Budget authority	222.2	230.2	241.2	254.1	266.9
Outlays	180.3	188.5	198.0	207.3	216.9
650 Social Security:					
Budget authority	5.9	6.5	7.1	7.7	8.4
Outlays	8.4	9.1	9.7	10.4	11.2
700 Veterans:					
Budget authority	34.3	35.7	35.8	36.4	37.0
Outlays	34.0	35.4	37.0	36.2	35.9
750 Administration of justice:					
Budget authority	13.7	14.3	14.1	14.3	14.7
Outlays	13.6	14.2	14.0	14.2	15.1
800 General government:					
Budget authority	11.6	11.9	11.5	11.7	12.1
Outlays	12.2	12.9	12.3	12.7	13.7
900 Net interest:					
Budget authority	235.4	253.0	268.8	280.4	292.5
Outlays	235.4	253.0	268.8	280.4	292.5
Gross interest (non-add):					
Budget authority	(312.8)	(337.9)	(357.0)	(369.9)	(380.7)
Outlays	(312.8)	(337.9)	(357.0)	(369.9)	(380.7)
920 Allowances:					
Budget authority	-2	0	0	0	0
Outlays	-13.2	-1.5	-1.0	-1.7	-1.2
950 Offsetting receipts:					
Budget authority	-34.4	-35.0	-33.9	-34.5	-35.0
Outlays	-33.1	-35.2	-33.9	-34.5	-35.0
Total, conference agreement:					
Budget authority	1,269.3	1,272.7	1,300.8	1,341.7	1,407.4
Outlays	1,201.6	1,212.1	1,234.4	1,209.1	1,276.9
Revenues	850.4	909.8	966.3	1,025.7	1,079.8
Deficit	351.2	302.3	268.1	183.4	197.1
Debt subject to limit	3,982.2	4,353.2	4,696.6	4,955.8	5,226.6
ADDENDUM—CONSOLIDATED TOTALS					
Social Security:					
Outlays	264.8	257.2	266.8	276.0	284.7
Revenues	318.8	341.0	365.2	389.7	415.6
Surplus	72.0	83.8	98.4	113.7	130.9
Postal Service: Outlays	-4	1.6	-1.4	-1.3	.1
Consolidated total:					
Outlays	1,448.0	1,470.9	1,499.8	1,483.8	1,561.7
Revenues	1,169.2	1,250.8	1,331.5	1,415.4	1,495.4
Deficit	278.8	220.1	168.3	68.4	66.3



## CONFERENCE AGREEMENT CREDIT SUMMARY

(In billions of dollars)

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Function 150:					
Direct loans .....	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.9	2.0
Primary guarantees .....	7.0	7.2	7.5	7.8	8.1
Secondary guarantees .....	.4	.4	.5	.5	.5
Function 270:					
Direct loans .....	1.3	1.4	1.5	1.5	1.5
Primary guarantees .....	.4	.2	.3	.3	.3
Function 350:					
Direct loans .....	7.5	7.3	7.1	6.8	6.8
Primary guarantees .....	8.2	7.6	7.8	7.8	7.8
Function 370:					
Direct loans .....	2.6	2.7	2.8	2.9	3.0
Primary guarantees .....	66.6	69.2	71.8	74.5	77.3
Secondary guarantees .....	83.4	86.8	90.2	93.9	97.6
Function 400: Direct loans .....				.1	.1
Function 450:					
Direct loans .....	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5
Primary guarantees .....	.3	.4	.4	.4	.4
Function 500: Primary guaran-					
tees .....	13.2	13.3	13.6	14.0	14.3
Function 550: Primary guaran-					
tees .....	.3	.3	.3	.3	.3
Function 600: Direct loans .....	.1	.1	.1	.1	.1
Function 700:					
Direct loans .....	.9	.9	.8	.8	.8
Primary guarantees .....	18.2	19.8	19.7	20.5	21.3
Total:					
Direct loans .....	15.4	15.6	15.5	15.6	15.8
Primary guaran-					
tees .....	114.2	118.0	121.4	125.6	129.8
Secondary guaran-					
tees .....	83.8	87.2	90.7	94.4	98.1

## DISCRETIONARY LEVELS IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT FOR 1992

(CBO estimates, dollars in billions)

	House passed	Senate passed	Conference agreement
DISCRETIONARY SPENDING BY FUNCTION			
050 Defense:			
Budget authority .....	291.4	291.4	291.4
Outlays .....	295.8	295.8	295.8
150 International Affairs:			
Budget authority .....	21.8	22.2	21.8
Outlays .....	19.8	19.8	19.8
250 Space, science, tech-			
nology:			
Budget authority .....	17.7	16.5	17.1
Outlays .....	16.7	16.2	16.5
270 Energy:			
Budget authority .....	6.4	5.6	6.4
Outlays .....	5.4	5.2	5.3
300 Environment:			
Budget authority .....	19.7	19.8	19.8
Outlays .....	19.6	20.0	19.7
350 Agriculture:			
Budget authority .....	3.4	3.6	3.5
Outlays .....	3.4	3.5	3.5
370 Commerce, housing			
credit:			
Budget authority .....	3.4	3.6	3.6
Outlays .....	3.0	3.2	3.2
400 Transportation:			
Budget authority .....	14.5	13.8	14.5
Outlays .....	33.4	33.2	33.4
450 Comm., regional devel-			
opment:			
Budget authority .....	5.9	5.8	5.9
Outlays .....	6.1	6.1	6.1
500 Education:			
Budget authority .....	35.8	38.9	37.8
Outlays .....	33.5	34.4	34.1
550 Health:			
Budget authority .....	19.5	19.3	19.5
Outlays .....	18.6	18.4	18.5
570 Medicare:			
Budget authority .....	2.8	2.6	2.8
Outlays .....	2.7	2.6	2.7
600 Income Security:			
Budget authority .....	31.5	31.9	31.9
Outlays .....	29.6	30.4	29.8
650 Social Security:			
Budget authority .....	0	0	0
Outlays .....	2.5	2.3	2.5
700 Veterans:			
Budget authority .....	15.5	15.5	15.5
Outlays .....	15.4	15.4	15.4
750 Administration of jus-			
tice:			
Budget authority .....	13.9	12.9	13.4
Outlays .....	14.0	13.2	13.4
800 General government:			
Budget authority .....	10.4	11.5	10.4
Outlays .....	10.9	11.3	10.9
920 Allowances:			
Budget authority .....	0	-1.2	-2
Outlays .....	-2.6	-3.5	-2.6
950 Offset receipts:			
Budget authority .....	-.3	0	-1.8

## DISCRETIONARY LEVELS IN CONFERENCE AGREEMENT FOR 1992—Continued

(CBO estimates, dollars in billions)

	House passed	Senate passed	Conference agreement
Outlays .....	-3	0	-5
Subtotal, domestic:			
Budget authority .....	200.0	200.0	200.0
Outlays .....	211.9	211.9	211.9
Total, discretionary:			
Budget authority .....	513.1	513.5	513.1
Outlays .....	527.5	527.5	527.5

The conferees note that both the House and Senate resolutions were within the discretionary spending limits in all categories in all years. Likewise, both resolutions met the pay-as-you-go requirement of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. The conference agreement also meets these limits and requirements in all years.

The functional distribution of budget authority and outlays in the out-years is not intended to foreclose decisions on the appropriate level of discretionary funding in any given function.

## ALLOCATIONS AMONG COMMITTEES

Sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (as amended by the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990) require the joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on a concurrent resolution on the budget to include an allocation, based upon that concurrent resolution as recommended in the conference report, of the appropriate levels of total outlays, total new budget authority, entitlement authority (for the House only), and Social Security outlays (for the Senate only) among each committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives that has jurisdiction over legislation providing those amounts. Section 602 further requires this allocation to include all years covered by the resolution, as well as the total for all those years. These allocations provide the basis for congressional enforcement of the resolution through points of order under the Congressional Budget Act. These allocations follow:

## SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FOR 1992

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Appropriations .....	721,617	730,848		
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry .....	19,780	14,377	14,715	5,908
Armed Services .....	49,494	36,297		
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs .....	107,100	99,810		
Commerce, Science, and Transportation .....	2,342	174	485	482
Energy and Natural Resources .....	1,654	1,256	60	60
Environment and Public Works .....	17,893	1,787		
Finance .....	491,243	487,336	96,746	96,403
Foreign Relations .....	12,174	11,159		
Governmental Affairs .....	73,598	48,540	500	500
Judiciary .....	2,758	2,397	157	155
Labor and Human Resources .....	6,601	6,723	5,339	4,126

## SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FOR 1992—Continued

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Rules and Administration .....	45	170		
Veterans Affairs .....	1,646	1,539	17,101	17,073
Select Indian Affairs .....	482	483		
Small Business .....	300	-146		
Not allocated to commodities .....	-239,426	-241,132		
Total .....	1,269,300	1,201,600	135,105	124,707

## SENATE COMMITTEE BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 302 OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT FOR 1992-96

(Dollars in millions)

Committee	Direct spending jurisdiction		Entitlements funded in annual appropriations	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry .....	76,631	54,849	104,604	55,601
Armed Services .....	268,841	198,918	0	0
Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs .....	243,115	87,591	0	0
Commerce, Science, and Transportation .....	12,686	962	2,765	2,746
Energy and Natural Resources .....	8,289	6,771	237	237
Environment and Public Works .....	111,328	9,639	0	0
Finance .....	2,829,397	2,808,129	591,260	590,124
Foreign Relations .....	55,676	53,580	0	750
Governmental Affairs .....	414,982	267,865	750	861
Judiciary .....	9,744	10,125	865	861
Labor and Human Resources .....	24,423	20,882	26,404	23,649
Rules and Administration .....	207	464	0	0
Veterans Affairs .....	7,679	7,822	90,933	90,734
Select Indian Affairs .....	2,567	2,501	0	0
Small Business .....	787	-1,096	0	0

## SENATE COMMITTEE REVENUE AND OUTLAY ALLOCATIONS FOR SOCIAL SECURITY PURSUANT TO SECTION 301(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION FOR 1992-96

(Dollars in millions)

	Conference agreement	
	1992	5-yr
Outlays:		
Finance Committee .....	284,348	1,592,450
Unassigned to committee .....	-37,548	-260,950
Subtotal, outlays .....	246,800	1,331,500
Revenues .....	318,800	1,830,300

## CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992

With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
050 National defense .....	164	164	0
150 International affairs .....	154	154	0
300 Natural resources and environment .....	1,896	1,967	0
350 Agriculture .....	9,293	636	0
370 Commerce and housing credit .....	42	4,041	0
400 Transportation .....	537	540	0
450 Community and regional development .....	1	1	0

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	10,520	9,302	0
550 Health	62,483	63,401	0
570 Medicare	37,158	38,158	0
600 Income security	61,488	61,351	0
650 Social Security	41	41	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	16,797	16,817	0
750 Administration of Justice	288	280	0
800 General government	6,742	6,742	0
900 Net interest	110	110	0
Subtotal	207,713	202,705	0
Discretionary appropriations action (assumed legislation):			
050 National defense	291,361	295,800	0
150 International affairs	21,773	19,751	0
250 General science, space, and technology	17,077	16,485	0
270 Energy	6,385	5,326	0
300 Natural resources and environment	19,767	19,704	0
350 Agriculture	3,481	3,459	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	3,582	3,221	0
400 Transportation	14,507	33,410	0
450 Community and regional development	5,948	6,072	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	37,793	34,088	0
550 Health	19,503	18,521	0
570 Medicare	2,758	2,744	0
600 Income security	31,865	29,801	0
650 Social Security	0	2,540	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	15,530	15,405	0
750 Administration of Justice	13,388	13,375	0
800 General government	10,428	10,898	0
920 Allowances	-233	-2,642	0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	-1,800	-500	0
Subtotal	513,113	527,458	0
Discretionary action by other committees (assumed entitlement legislation):			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	307	249	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	484	436	0
Subtotal	791	686	0
Committee total	721,617	730,848	0
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
150 International affairs	0	-433	0
270 Energy	186	107	0
300 Natural resources and environment	509	524	0
350 Agriculture	18,866	13,116	11,360
400 Transportation	38	38	0
450 Community and regional development	0	853	0
600 Income security	0	0	1,013
800 General government	321	322	321
900 Net interest	0	0	110
Subtotal	19,920	14,527	12,804
Committee total	19,920	14,527	12,804
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
050 National defense	11,471	11,473	22
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	4	3	0
600 Income security	37,805	24,649	24,649
700 Veterans benefits and services	196	165	165
Subtotal	49,476	36,291	24,836
Committee total	49,476	36,291	24,836
BANKING, FINANCE, AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
150 International affairs	0	-1,069	0

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
370 Commerce and housing credit	101,840	97,371	0
450 Community and regional development	12	-173	0
600 Income security	100	175	0
800 General government	97	97	0
900 Net interest	2,476	2,476	0
Subtotal	104,526	98,878	0
Committee total	104,526	98,878	0
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA			
Current level (enacted law):			
750 Administration of Justice	19	19	19
Subtotal	19	19	19
Committee total	19	19	19
EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	3,391	3,532	4,854
600 Income security	112	99	7,948
Subtotal	3,504	3,631	12,802
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	0	56
Subtotal	0	0	56
Committee total	3,504	3,631	12,858
ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
270 Energy	0	123	0
300 Natural resources and environment	0	26	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	56	58	0
550 Health	112	123	59,700
600 Income security	14,004	13,855	10,652
800 General government	8	8	8
Subtotal	14,180	14,192	70,361
Committee total	14,180	14,192	70,361
FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
150 International affairs	11,229	10,779	0
600 Income security	944	380	380
800 General government	6	6	0
Subtotal	12,179	11,165	380
Committee total	12,179	11,165	380
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
800 General government	21	18	0
Subtotal	21	18	0
Committee total	21	18	0
HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	11	11	0
800 General government	34	159	239
Subtotal	44	170	239
Committee total	44	170	239
INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
270 Energy	340	-33	0
300 Natural resources and environment	175	149	18
450 Community and regional development	477	459	371

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

[In millions of dollars]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
550 Health	4	4	0
800 General government	845	836	874
Subtotal	1,840	1,414	1,264
Committee total	1,840	1,414	1,264
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
370 Commerce and housing credit	215	223	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	1,123	827	0
600 Income security	29	10	9
750 Administration of Justice	957	903	157
800 General government	433	433	500
Subtotal	2,757	2,396	667
Committee total	2,757	2,396	667
MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
300 Natural resources and environment	530	464	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	76	71	0
400 Transportation	5	0	485
600 Income security	13	6	0
800 General government	7	7	0
Subtotal	630	548	485
Committee total	630	548	485
POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
370 Commerce and housing credit	1	1	0
550 Health	0	285	3,067
600 Income security	59,195	33,855	33,855
800 General government	14,363	14,363	0
Subtotal	73,559	48,504	36,922
Committee total	73,559	48,504	36,922
PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
270 Energy	1,135	855	0
300 Natural resources and environment	208	167	0
400 Transportation	3,439	0	0
450 Community and regional development	5	110	0
800 General government	13	67	0
Subtotal	4,800	1,197	0
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):			
400 Transportation	16,358	0	0
Subtotal	16,358	0	0
Committee total	21,158	1,197	0
SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
250 General science, space, and technology	21	20	0
270 Energy	15	15	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	1	1	0
Subtotal	37	36	0
Committee total	37	36	0
SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE			
Current level (enacted law):			
370 Commerce and housing credit	300	173	0
450 Community and regional development	0	-319	0
Subtotal	-300	-146	0
Committee total	300	-146	0



CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
<b>VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</b>			
Current level (enacted law):			
700 Veterans benefits and services	2,614	2,472	18,152
Subtotal	2,614	2,472	18,152
Discretionary action (assumed legislation):			
700 Veterans benefits and services	0	0	484
Subtotal	0	0	484
Committee total	2,614	2,614	18,636
<b>WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE</b>			
Current level (enacted law):			
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	0	0	5,644
550 Health	1,005	1,005	1,005
570 Medicare	130,291	127,060	127,027
600 Income security	27,528	26,988	59,206
650 Social security	5,812	5,812	0
750 Administration of Justice	271	271	0

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
800 General government	413	412	412
900 Net interest	315,024	315,024	315,024
Subtotal	480,345	476,572	508,318
Committee total	480,345	476,572	508,318
<b>UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEE</b>			
Current level (enacted law):			
050 National defense	-12,196	-12,138	0
150 International affairs	-11,257	-11,282	0
250 General science, space, and technology	2	-5	0
270 Energy	-1,861	-1,892	0
300 Natural resources and environment	-3,585	-3,602	0
350 Agriculture	-9,240	-211	0
370 Commerce and housing credit	-211	-259	0
400 Transportation	-284	-288	0
450 Community and regional development	-344	-303	0
500 Education, training, employment, and social services	-51	-113	0

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEE PURSUANT TO SEC. 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT—FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued  
With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

(In millions of dollars)

	Budget authority	Outlays	Entitlement authority
550 Health	-7	-38	0
570 Medicare	-50,107	-50,062	0
600 Income security	-10,882	-10,869	0
650 Social security	47	7	0
700 Veterans benefits and services	-1,321	-1,294	0
750 Administration of Justice	-1,223	-1,247	0
800 General government	-22,131	-22,168	0
900 Net interest	-82,210	-82,210	-53,807
920 Allowances	33	-10,558	0
950 Undistributed offsetting receipts	-32,600	-32,600	0
Subtotal	-239,426	-241,132	-53,807
Committee total	-239,426	-241,132	-53,807
Total—Current level	739,038	673,457	633,443
Total—Discretionary action	530,262	528,143	540
Grand total	1,269,300	1,201,600	633,982

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ACT

With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

(By fiscal year, in millions of dollars)

	1992		1993		1994		1995		1996		1992-96	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
<b>APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	207,713	202,705	222,893	214,757	244,121	236,173	263,542	253,876	261,476	251,586	1,194,891	1,155,805
Discretionary:												
Defense	291,361	295,800	291,480	292,523								
International	21,773	19,751	22,737	20,825								
Domestic	199,979	211,907	207,370	224,541								
Subtotal	513,113	527,458	521,587	537,689	518,064	537,650	524,975	543,028	544,924	563,664	2,622,663	2,709,489
Discretionary action by other committees	791	686	6,073	5,635	6,700	6,388	7,276	6,919	31,639	30,614	57,333	53,534
Committee total	721,617	730,848	750,553	758,081	768,885	780,211	795,793	803,823	838,039	845,864	3,874,887	3,918,827
<b>AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	19,920	14,527	16,454	12,637	14,516	10,787	15,260	9,310	7,461	4,758	73,611	52,019
Discretionary action	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3,720	3,540	3,720	3,540
Committee total	19,920	14,527	16,454	12,637	14,516	10,787	15,260	9,310	11,181	8,298	77,331	55,559
New entitlement authority		0		0		0		0		4,716		4,716
<b>ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	49,476	36,291	51,556	37,951	53,610	39,687	55,890	41,537	58,225	43,421	268,757	198,887
<b>BANKING, FINANCE, AND URBAN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	104,526	98,878	56,227	48,241	35,599	25,173	17,737	-46,581	14,933	-42,656	229,022	83,055
<b>DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	19	19	19	19	20	20	21	21	22	22	101	101
<b>EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	3,504	3,631	2,582	2,771	1,422	1,588	689	768	383	-3,911	8,580	4,847
New entitlement authority		56		4,864		4,948		5,064		5,221		20,153
<b>ENERGY AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	14,180	14,192	14,461	14,505	14,859	14,912	15,241	15,323	15,518	15,638	74,259	74,570
<b>FOREIGN AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	12,179	11,165	11,542	11,088	10,920	10,820	10,587	10,435	10,472	10,099	55,700	53,607
<b>GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	21	18	22	19	23	20	24	20	25	21	115	98
<b>HOUSE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	44	170	41	13	41	8	40	34	40	239	206	464

## CONFERENCE AGREEMENT ON H. CON. RES. 121, ALLOCATION OF SPENDING RESPONSIBILITY TO HOUSE COMMITTEES PURSUANT TO SECTION 602(a) OF THE CONGRESSIONAL

## BUDGET ACT—Continued

## With Additional Assumptions Regarding "Discretionary Spending Limits"

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1992		1993		1994		1995		1996		1992-96	
	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays	Budget authority	Outlays
<b>INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	1,840	1,414	1,859	1,499	1,876	1,625	1,895	1,613	1,901	1,627	9,371	7,778
<b>JUDICIARY COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	2,757	2,396	1,696	2,261	1,727	1,960	1,763	1,740	1,800	1,766	9,743	10,123
<b>MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	630	548	660	584	681	633	695	665	720	686	3,386	3,116
<b>POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	73,559	48,504	77,712	50,691	82,913	52,758	87,964	55,348	92,620	60,368	414,768	267,669
<b>PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	4,800	1,197	2,011	1,580	2,356	1,855	1,764	1,168	1,540	740	12,471	6,540
Discretionary action	16,358	0	21,929	0	24,225	0	26,503	0	28,784	0	117,799	0
Committee total	21,158	1,197	23,940	1,580	26,581	1,855	28,267	1,168	30,324	740	130,270	6,540
<b>SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	37	36	29	29	26	26	24	24	24	24	140	139
<b>SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	300	-146	280	-222	156	-253	51	-237	0	-238	787	-1,096
<b>VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	2,614	2,472	2,499	2,652	2,271	2,606	2,334	2,424	2,049	2,205	11,767	12,359
New entitlement authority		484		948		1,266		1,722		2,391		6,811
<b>WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	480,345	476,572	519,540	515,810	556,704	552,563	591,571	586,561	623,890	618,685	2,772,050	2,750,191
New entitlement authority		0		0		214		207		199		620
<b>UNASSIGNED TO COMMITTEE</b>												
Current level (enacted law)	-239,426	-241,132	-258,972	-248,109	-272,030	-262,599	-284,146	-274,896	-294,766	-285,998	-1,349,340	-1,312,734
Total current level	739,038	673,457	723,111	668,776	751,811	690,362	782,946	659,153	798,333	679,082	3,790,385	3,367,538
Total discretionary action	530,262	528,143	549,589	543,324	548,989	544,038	558,754	549,947	609,067	597,818	2,801,515	2,766,562
Grand totals	1,269,300	1,201,600	1,272,700	1,212,100	1,300,800	1,234,400	1,341,700	1,209,100	1,407,400	1,276,900	6,591,900	6,134,100
Total new entitlement authority		540		5,812		6,428		6,993		12,527		32,300

## COAST GUARD FUNDING

The conferees concur with the language in the report accompanying the House resolution stating that military activities of the Coast Guard should be considered as defense rather than domestic discretionary spending. See H.R. Rep. No. 102-32, 102d Cong., 1st Sess., at 65 (1991).

## FUNCTION 800

The conferees assume and intend that no cut in the rate of pay of Government employees will be necessary to achieve the levels set forth in the conference agreement for function 800 (General Government).

## FUNCTION 950

Function 950 contains an unallocated reduction across all functions within the domestic discretionary cap of \$1.8 billion in budget authority and \$500 million in outlays in fiscal year 1992.

## REPORT LANGUAGE

The conferees intend that language in the reports of the Senate and House Committees on the Budget on the concurrent resolution on the budget that has not been modified by this conference report remains as a source of legislative history on the drafters' intent on the concurrent resolution.

## ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

The conference agreement is based on the following economic assumptions:

## CBO ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS

[Calendar year, percent]

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Real GNP increase	0	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.7	2.7
Consumer price index increase	4.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6
3-mo Treasury bill rate	6.6	7.0	6.7	6.3	5.9	5.7
10-yr Treasury note rate	7.9	7.7	7.6	7.4	7.3	7.2
Unemployment rate	6.8	6.4	6.2	6.0	5.8	5.6

## NUMERICAL DISPLAYS

Section 3 of the Senate amendment sets forth the increase in the debt. The Budget Enforcement Act amended section 301(b)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act to allow for display in the budget resolution of a heading entitled "Debt Increase as Measure of Deficit" in which the resolution may set forth the amounts by which the debt subject to limit would increase in each of the relevant fiscal years.

Section 4 of the Senate amendment shows retirement trust fund balances. Once again, the Budget Enforcement Act amended section 301(b)(6) of the Congressional Budget Act to allow a heading entitled "Display of Federal Retirement Trust Fund Balances" in which the resolution may set forth the balances of the Federal retirement trust funds.

Section 5 of the Senate amendment displays, for enforcement purposes in the Senate, the levels of Social Security revenues

and outlays. The Budget Enforcement Act amended sections 301(a)(6) and 301(a)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act to provide for these displays.

Section 6(19) of the Senate amendment shows the levels of gross interest consistent with the levels of net interest shown in major functional category 900, which appear in section 6(18) of the Senate amendment.

As in past years, the Senate amendment displays levels for secondary loan guarantee commitments.

The House resolution sets forth none of these numerical displays. The House resolution does, however, revise the levels for fiscal year 1991, while the Senate does not.

The conference agreement sets forth numerical displays as in the Senate amendment. The conference agreement also includes language applicable only in the House on levels for fiscal year 1991.

## MISCELLANEOUS LANGUAGE PROVISIONS

The Senate amendment also contains a number of miscellaneous language provisions at the conclusion of the budget resolution. The House resolution contains no such provisions.

## ASSET SALES AND LOAN PREPAYMENTS

Section 7 of the Senate amendment is a provision on asset sales that is very similar to those in every budget resolution since that for fiscal year 1988. This section would



prevent, during the time that the budget resolution is in effect, the use for spending of the proceeds from asset sales and loan prepayments. It does this by prohibiting the counting of asset sales for purposes of the allocations to committees under sections 302, 601, and 602 of the Congressional Budget Act. This provision is consistent with section 257(e) of Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, which prohibits the counting of asset sales and loan prepayments for the purposes of determining whether that Act calls for across-the-board cuts. This section does not preclude asset sales or loan prepayments nor does it determine whether an action constitutes an asset sale, a loan prepayment, or neither. It adopts the definition of those terms that exists in current law.

The conference agreement also includes a provision on asset sales similar to that in the Senate amendment. The language in the conference agreement extends the prohibition of counting asset sales to sections 311, 604, and 605. The conferees thus intend the rule on asset sales to be uniform for all purposes.

#### ACCOUNTING TREATMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES

The new law requires the budget resolution to provide two numbers for each year for Social Security enforcement in the Senate: a ceiling on outlays and a floor for revenues. Under existing laws, if the budget resolution increases the outlay ceiling, then legislation that raises Social Security outlays would be in order in the Senate later in the year. Under the existing law, if the budget resolution lowers the revenue floor, then legislation that cut Social Security revenues would be in order in the Senate later in the year. In addition (under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act), if the budget resolution increased the outlay ceiling by some amount, then legislation that cut Social Security revenues by an equal amount would also be in order in the Senate later in the year, and vice versa. The language of section 8 of the Senate amendment would, during the time that the budget resolution is in effect, preclude changes in Social Security that reduced any of the annual Social Security surpluses.

Section 8 of the Senate amendment also states the sense of the Congress that the Congress should not enact major reductions in Social Security revenues unless the current actuarial estimates of the Social Security Trust Funds over the next 75 years indicate the Trust Funds are actuarially sound. Currently, the actuarial estimates for the next 75 years show a slight imbalance for the Trust Funds. This language does not address the question of enactment of legislation that would restore the actuarial balance of the Trust Funds over a 75 year period, even though it reduced revenues in some years.

The conference agreement contains the language of section 8 of the Senate amendment that preclude changes in Social Security that reduce any of the annual Social Security surpluses. The conference agreement also includes language stating the sense of the Senate that the Social Security levels in the budget resolution are consistent with the assumption that if the Congress adopts legislation to address the "notch" in Social Security benefits or any other legislation affecting Social Security, that such legislation shall include other changes to Social Security outlays and revenues to ensure that the annual Social Security surpluses that accrue to the Social Security Trust Fund are not reduced.

#### RESERVE FUND FOR FAMILY AND ECONOMIC SECURITY INITIATIVES

Section 9 of the Senate amendment sets forth a reserve fund to provide for deficit neutral direct spending initiatives in five areas: (a) improvements in the health and nutrition of children and provision of services to protect children and strengthen families, (b) economic recovery initiatives for unemployment compensation or other, related programs, (c) continuing improvements in ongoing health care programs or beginning phasing-in health insurance coverage for all Americans, (d) expanding access to early childhood development services for low-income pre-schoolers, and (e) surface transportation.

Specifically, section 9 provides that, in the Senate, budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees when the committee or committees, or a committee of conference, report legislation achieving one or more of the objectives referenced above, and that will, if enacted, also provide for reductions in budget authority and outlays sufficient to pay for the reported initiative and not increase the deficit in this resolution. Upon the reporting of the legislation, and again upon the submission of a conference report, the Chairman of the Budget Committee may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section.

The House resolution has no such provision. The report accompanying the House resolution notes that under the 1990 budget agreement, entitlement increases and tax reductions must be paid for with offsetting spending cuts or revenue increases. The report lists several similar pay-as-you-go initiatives which the House Budget Committee expects to be considered during the current session of Congress. Included are: (a) investments in children through improvements in nutrition, foster care, child welfare, and social services programs, (b) improvements in unemployment insurance coverage, (c) improvements in medicare and medicaid and an initiative to provide access to health care insurance for all uncovered Americans, (d) energy security and infrastructure investment, (e) revenue neutral changes in the tax code, and (f) partial public funding for Federal legislative elections. See H.R. REP. NO. 102-32, 102d Cong., 1st Sess., at 114-16 (1991).

The conference agreement contains reserve fund language similar to that in the Senate amendment. Specifically, section 9 of the conference agreement provides that, in the Senate, budget authority and outlays may be allocated to a committee or committees when the committee or committees, or a committee of conference, report legislation achieving one or more of the objectives referenced above, and that will not increase the deficit. Upon the reporting of the legislation, and again upon the submission of a conference report, the Chairman of the Budget Committee may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under sections 302(a) and 602(a) of the Congressional Budget Act and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. The conference agreement makes clear that deficit neutrality must be maintained for fiscal year 1992 and the total of the 5-year period covered by the resolution.

#### CHILDREN AND THE FAMILY

Section 10 of the Senate amendment states that the sense of the Congress that if Congress enacts an income surtax on millionaires, then Congress will use the revenue

generated by that surtax to offset a commensurate increase in direct tax assistance to families, which will include increasing dependent exemptions and tax credits for children.

The conference agreement contains language similar to section 10 of the Senate amendment.

#### HIGH PRIORITY DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS

Section 11 of the Senate amendment states the finding that inefficient, parochial, and outdated Federal programs exist in both the domestic and defense areas. Section 11 also states the sense of the Congress that, within the discretionary caps, the Committees on Appropriations should (1) consider proposals to terminate substandard and inefficient programs in 1992, (2) reduce the Federal investment in outdated programs, and (3) reallocate those resources to higher-priority programs.

Although the House resolution contains no such language, the report accompanying the House resolution includes language noting that although the perception is often exaggerated that the Federal Government is wasteful and inefficient, there is always room for improvement and reform. See H.R. REP. NO. 102-32, 102d Cong., 1st Sess., at 193-94 (1991). The report then recommends a variety of organizations and programs as examples to be examined for possible elimination, consolidation, or independent funding.

The conference agreement contains no such language.

#### FAIRNESS IN FEDERAL PROGRAM BENEFITS

Section 12 of the Senate amendment states the finding that Federal spending for all segments of the population has grown significantly over the last 2 decades, and that Federal benefits increasingly have been provided not necessarily to the poor, but to those who have pre-transfer incomes above the poverty line. Substantial amounts of Federal spending—nearly \$26.5 billion in calendar year 1989—went to households with incomes in the top 20 percent. Section 12 lists several programs that continue to grow. Section 12 states the sense of the Congress in support of a wiser, more fair and more equitable distribution of Federal benefits. Section 12 states that subsidies provided to the wealthiest should be either redirected to provide more assistance to the poor or applied to further deficit reduction.

The conference agreement contains no such language.

#### VETERANS' PROGRAMS

Section 13 of the Senate amendment states that sense of the Congress that veterans' programs are to top national priority and that critical veterans needs—particularly in the areas of medical care—must be addressed. The section urges the Committees on Appropriations, while acting within the discretionary caps, to give maximum consideration to veterans' benefits programs.

Section 13 also notes that, as a result of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, some disabled, mentally incompetent veterans may be receiving discriminatory treatment. The Reconciliation Act of 1990 provides that institutionalized incompetent veterans without spouse, child, or dependent, whose estate exceeds \$25,000 (excluding the value of the home), are not eligible for compensation benefits until the value of the estate is reduced to \$10,000. Section 13 states that sense of the Congress that this law may be inconsistent with the Americans with Disabilities Act and, therefore, may be discriminatory. Section 13 further states that the committees of jurisdiction should

modify the provisions of the Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990, on a deficit-neutral basis, to provide alternative methods for achieving the budget savings assumed within the Act.

The conference agreement contains language similar to that in the Senate amendment regarding the importance of veterans' programs.

#### DEFICIT REDUCTION

Section 14 of the Senate amendment finds that the deficit has grown, the economy has declined, the savings and loan bailout has become costlier, foreign interest rates are high, and that further deficit reduction should be combined with other steps to lower interest rates and foster long-term growth. Section 14 also states the sense of the Congress that the Budget Committees, along with the administration and the bipartisan congressional leadership should develop a comprehensive, multi-year plan for further deficit reduction for Congress to consider next year.

The conference agreement contains no such language.

#### TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND

Section 15 of the Senate amendment finds that the transportation trust fund is onbudget and that inclusion creates the illusion that the deficit is being brought into the balance, that the trust fund was intended for construction and maintenance and infrastructure, that using it for that purpose would bolster the economy, and that the trust funds would best be protected by excluding them from the deficit. Section 15 also states the sense of the Congress that Congress should enact legislation to exclude the trust funds from the definition of the deficit.

The conference agreement contains no such language.

#### PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT IN THE HOUSE

Rule XLIX of the Rules of the House of Representatives sets forth a procedure for changing the statutory limit on the level of the public debt.

This concurrent resolution sets forth the appropriate level of the public debt for the coming fiscal year, 1992. Under the rule, upon final passage by both bodies of a concurrent resolution on the budget, the public debt level for fiscal year 1992 set forth in the resolution would be incorporated into the text of joint resolution.

Pursuant to the rule, the text of the joint resolution would be as follows:

That subsection (b) of section 3101 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by striking out the dollar limitation contained in such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof \$3,982,200,000,000.

Under the rule, that joint resolution is then deemed passed by the House and sent to the Senate for its consideration. If the Senate approves the joint resolution without amendment, the joint resolution is sent to the President for his signature. (If the Senate were to amend the joint resolution, the measure would be returned to the House for further action.)

Legislative jurisdiction over the public debt remains in the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule does not preclude that committee from originating public debt bills whenever necessary.

LEON E. PANETTA,  
RICHARD GEPHARDT,  
JAMES L. OBERSTAR,  
FRANK J. GUARINI,  
DICK DURBIN,  
MIKE ESPY,

DALE E. KILDEE,  
ANTHONY C. BEILENSON,  
JERRY HUCKABY,  
MARTIN OLAV SABO,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

JIM SASSER,  
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
DON RIEGLE,  
PAUL SIMON,  
WYCHE FOWLER,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992 AND 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURTHA). Pursuant to House Resolution 156 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2100.

□ 1218

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2100) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, with Mr. POSHARD (Chairman pro tempore) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] had been disposed of.

It is now in order to debate the subject matter of burden sharing. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN].

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, on our side, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be managing the time on behalf of the committee for this part of the debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. POSHARD). Without objection, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] will be handling the time on this side for the debate on burden sharing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

□ 1220

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, this is the year of burden sharing. I will explain why.

First, Desert Shield/Storm proved two things. It proved that the allies really can contribute much more to the common defense. Japan came up with almost \$11 billion; Germany finally coughed up \$6.5 billion. France and Britain sent troops and ships and planes. A year ago, none of us would have believed that our allies would do this much. I still think what they did was inadequate and we haven't collected all the pledges yet. The fact remains, however, that the Persian Gulf conflict was a new high water mark for burden sharing.

Desert Shield/Storm also proved that our diplomats really can successfully solicit contributions from our allies when need be. Usually, all we hear from the White House, the State Department, and the Defense Department is lame excuses on why the allies cannot do more. Something strange happens when our diplomats go to negotiate: they come back talking like the guy on the other side of the table. Yet, for the Persian Gulf conflict, they brought home the bacon.

Second, the role of the U.S. military throughout the world has really changed. During the cold war, we were containing possible aggression by the Soviet Union because it made more sense to stop expansionism at the Fulda Gap than in New York Harbor. Now, our forces are helping to maintain stability and permit economic development and democratization throughout the world. Those are still vital U.S. interests. Yet, they do not rise to the survival level of the cold war threat. In other words, in the new world order, we have every right to expect our allies to bear a much greater proportion of the common defense burden than of the old burden.

And, the administration appears thoroughly oblivious to changes in the world. Look at this chart showing troop levels in Europe from 1983 to today. The Berlin Wall has collapsed and we have cut troop levels by less than 10 percent.

Third, we are running out of money. The budget agreement capped defense spending for the next 5 years and it does not provide enough money to maintain anything like our current overseas military establishment. We will need both to cut our troops abroad and to get much more financial help from our allies.

Fourth, we are closing bases at home. I cannot explain to the people of Denver why it makes sense to close Lowry Air Force Base, as Secretary Cheney has proposed, while building a new base in Crotone, Italy, as Secretary Cheney



has also proposed. I cannot explain why it makes sense to close dozens of domestic bases while refusing to close anything except a few gas stations and liquor stores in Germany.

We have five amendments in order under the rule. I will be supporting each of these amendments. Let me briefly describe what each of these amendments would do:

**Schroeder amendment:** Establishes sense of Congress that number of U.S. troops in Europe should be reduced to 100,000 by fiscal year 1995.

**Frank amendment:** Reduces authorization by \$8 billion, requiring that the reduction come through reductions in forces and equipment assigned to Europe, Japan, or Korea. Also, requires report on overseas base closure criteria, activities to close foreign bases, fair market value, and status of negotiations.

**Dorgan amendment:** Instructs the President to negotiate a proportionate defense cost-sharing agreement with each nation in which the United States has troops stationed. Establishes a mutual defense payments account to track cost-sharing contributions for each such country.

**Bryant amendment:** Placing a cap, which goes lower each year, on the number of foreign national employees that can be employed by DOD at the end of each future fiscal year.

**Mrazek amendment:** Places cap of 30,000 on number of United States troops assigned to Korea—down from 43,000—and create an Army sublimit of 20,000. Also, encourages transfer of leading role from United States to Korea.

I will be speaking later in more detail on each of these amendments. I urge my colleagues to support them.

**Mr. MARTIN.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON], the ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

**Mr. DICKINSON.** Mr. Chairman, we now begin debate on a series of amendments politely entitled "burden sharing," but which are thinly disguised efforts to bash our allies and force a return to Fortress America. Such efforts have more to do with political expediency than with a constructive debate on defense issues.

Allocating these amendments 4 hours of floor time, more time I might add than has been granted to any debate this year, suggests that the Committee on Armed Services found major burden-sharing problems.

In fact, the amount allocated is inconsistent, to the burden-sharing facts, is out of sync with what the committee found.

Let me read some of the quotes that the committee itself found on burden sharing: "1990 was a remarkable year for burden sharing." Another, "Last year was also remarkable in terms of

more traditional burden sharing." Another quote, "Real burden-sharing progress occurred with Japan and Korea." Another quote, "And by 1995, current Department of Defense plans call for the elimination of nearly 60 percent of the Army divisions and over 60 percent of the tactical fighter wings now stationed in Europe."

Some other facts substantiated by the committee are also informative. Recent burden-sharing agreements with Japan will make it cheaper for the United States to base its forces there than in the United States. In effect, the only things that Japan will not pay for are the United States salaries and operational costs, costs that the United States would incur anywhere its forces are stationed.

In Korea, cost sharing has increased \$32 million in 1988 to \$150 million in 1991, more than fourfold increase. Concluded agreements ensure that the Korean Government—which now pays 22 percent of all won-based United States costs—will continue to pay higher shares.

Desert Storm pledges continue to come in. Recent GAO testimony before congressional committees indicates that we can expect our allies to meet their pledges in a timely manner, and that the amounts they contribute are likely to exceed the U.S. costs of the war.

General Galvin, our commander in chief in Europe, testified repeatedly that the Department of Defense will reduce United States forces in Europe by at least 50 percent by the year 1995. What more can we expect than 50 percent in the next 5 years?

NATO remains one of our best burden-sharing agreements, with our allies picking up more than 70 percent of the cost. In Asia and the Pacific, the Department of Defense has already announced personnel cuts of 12 to 15 percent, to be achieved by 1992. The Department has pledged to continue reductions as threats diminish, and as dictated by our overall security interests.

Despite these facts, though, we will spend 4 hours today addressing amendments whose underlying principle is, unless our allies pay all of our overseas costs, we will withdraw totally, completely, and immediately, back to Fortress America.

Could our allies do more to contribute to the collective defense? Sure they could, and Congress has a responsibility to demand equitable burden sharing. However, the underlying philosophy and specific measures proposed by the five burden-sharing amendments have nothing to do with equality.

I oppose these measures for three fundamental reasons: first, our forces are deployed overseas to protect U.S. national interests and provide U.S. security. Not just overseas. Moreover, our men and women in uniform are not

hired guns available to the highest bidder, as some of the amendments would make them seem.

Second, the House Committee on Armed Services has ratified a national defense strategy known as the base force policy which calls for the continued forward deployment of United States troops, albeit it in reduced numbers, in both Asia and Europe. Nothing that the committee found about the threats of our financial security would support the more rapid overseas drawdown; nothing. The total withdrawal or allied bashing embodied in these amendments is unconscionable; I consider it a measure of weakness. Of the amendments, none of them, not even the one offered by my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], was presented to the House Committee on Armed Services for indepth evaluation during the authorization process. We did not hold a hearing on these.

Therefore, for the House to potentially adopt these amendments after just several hours of debate on the House floor, without hearings, without going into them, without having witnesses, I think is shortsighted and unfair.

□ 1230

Third, the world has changed, but not in ways that the authors of these amendments would have you believe. As Deputy National Security Director Robert Gates said recently, "We must look anew at the world and our role in it."

Contrary to the predictions of some on both the left and the right to pass burdens of leadership internationally to others, a return to isolationism is not possible; not for a nation that exported more than 673 billion dollars' worth of goods last year and whose cultural and political influence is so pervasive.

As I see it then we must find new ways of asserting leadership, and burden sharing and the bashing of our allies is not the way to do it.

**Mrs. SCHROEDER.** Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY], a distinguished member of the subcommittee.

**Mr. BILBRAY.** Mr. Chairman, I rise to encourage my colleagues to follow the lead of the Armed Services Committee in adopting a responsible approach to the vital issues of our overseas deployments and the contributions made by our allies to our common security.

As always, a responsible approach to these issues must be based on an understanding of the most fundamental principle of our foreign and security policies—that is, our overseas activities, including the deployment and use of our Armed Forces, are designed to serve American interests and provide for American security. Our proud men

and women in uniform, so important to our victories in the cold war and the gulf war, are not mercenaries for hire to the highest bidder. They fly the red, white and blue—not a "Have Gun, Will Travel" poster.

A responsible approach to these issues should also be instructed by the fact that the Department of Defense, with a great deal of scrutiny and oversight from the Congress, has been working to develop a plan for transitioning to a considerably smaller and more home-based military, while providing for U.S. security amidst the uncertainties and instabilities of a changing world.

The plan laid out in Armed Services Committee hearings calls for:

First, cutting about one quarter of our military force structure over 5 years. And, in spite of the increased force size resulting from Desert Storm, DOD reports it will be back on the projected time lines for that reduction by next year;

Second, greatly reducing our forward deployed forces. Just a couple of years ago, authorized U.S. troop strength in Europe was more than 325,000. Last year, the Congress cut that to about 260,000. The plan before us now for Europe is to go from two corps to one, and from seven air wings to three. We are also withdrawing more than 15,000 troops from the Pacific Theater in the first phase of reductions there; and

Third, the plan is to cut overseas deployments further as U.S. interests and the international situation permit.

We should keep in mind, also, that the Armed Services Committee and the entire Congress have been pressing hard for a more equitable distribution of the burdens and responsibilities of defense among our allies. Our efforts have had considerable effect. Contributions to the common defense have increased, especially from Japan and Korea. Allied contributions to U.S. operations in Desert Shield/Desert Storm are climbing to close to \$40 billion. In fact, the Department of Defense recently reported to Congress that allied contributions for calendar year 1990 covered about 73 percent of U.S. Desert Shield costs for that year and that such contributions could well cover an even greater percentage of U.S. war costs for 1991.

Mr. Chairman, the Defense authorization bill before us represents the best efforts of the Armed Services Committee to insure that our defense budget, force structure, and forward deployments are adjusted to new realities, while taking care of our men and women in uniform at home and overseas. It also reflects the requirement to make such adjustments within the budget resolution, as well as our constant efforts toward the equitable distribution among our allies of the burdens and responsibilities of our common security.

I urge my colleagues to chart a responsible course through the five burdensharing amendments today. I especially urge them to reject the attempt, euphemistically entitled a "burdensharing" amendment, to cut \$8 billion across the board from this bill. That would certainly not be a responsible course of action.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard a number of great speeches on the floor over the course of the past couple days. A common thread runs through them that the cold war is over and now we have to gallop to retrench as fast as we can, as obviously they would argue, the world is safe and there are no more Saddam Husseins or people of that ilk to cause wars around the world and that we can just relax.

Last evening for those who had the opportunity to see it, a local TV channel was running a documentary that had President John F. Kennedy standing before the Berlin Wall giving his famous speech nearly 30 years ago. Indeed, America has paid a large part of keeping the world peace. People have said that we have paid more than our share. I think we would all agree with that, but I do not think many of us would trade the money that was spent for what could have been a disastrous nuclear war or another conflict in the Pacific or in Europe.

Indeed, I wish that President Kennedy could have lived to see that wall come down. I am sure he would have been proud, as I am proud, of what America has done since 1945 to try to keep world peace.

I want to take special note and thank the Rules Committee for allowing 4 hours of debate on this portion of the bill. We are back here as it were by popular demand. Last year it was such a successful exercise bashing all of our allies, past and present, and railing on against institutions such as NATO, that I think it is appropriate that we have more time this year so that everyone can be heard and bash the nation of their choice.

I heard comments made on the floor that somehow our forces around the world are in the case of Europe—defending Europe; or in the case of Japan, defending Japan, or in the case of Korea, defending Korea.

I would like to point out that I hope there comes a time when no American soldier has to be stationed anywhere in the world outside of the continental United States.

It is probably an old-fashioned outdated feeling I have that the object of the exercise ought to be providing for our Nation's defense and trying to preserve world peace. We found out years ago that more often than not when a war starts, the United States ends up in it.

I think that investment that was made since the time of John F. Kennedy for preserving world peace was money well spent.

I can think of no reason for stationing a single soldier, airman or marine, either in Europe or in Japan, if it is not in the best interest of this Nation, the United States of America. We are certainly not stationed in Japan at the present time to protect Japan. That is a very important part of the world. That is a part of the world where the economy of the world is now centered, in the Pacific, no longer the Atlantic. Some of us lose sight of that fact.

And yet, for us and for our allies, most of whom assisted in the recent war in the Persian Gulf, I think it is important that we have a Europe that is at peace.

We are going to have amendments offered that say how supportive we are of NATO. What we are not talking about too much is that the NATO infrastructure fund to which we contribute some 28 percent and the balance of the NATO countries some 72 percent, we say to them in another portion of the bill, "Yes, that might be the NATO infrastructure account, but before you build anything out of that account, I don't care what NATO says, we don't care what General Galvin says, we don't care what the President of the United States might say or Secretary Cheney, NATO, you better come check with the House of Representatives, or more appropriately, clear it with our committee before you use that NATO infrastructure fund."

□ 1240

I think that is the signal, not the nice language of the sense of Congress, that is most important and the thing that will be best understood by our NATO allies.

I would also point out in the time that I have, that a year ago, when we were considering the defense authorization bill on the floor, it was a time of relative peace. Little did we know that in the intervening year we would send nearly 550,000 Americans and thousands of allies from better than 20 countries around the world to engage in a war in Iraq and in Kuwait and have 60 to 70 percent of them return home before we would take up the next authorization bill.

I would like to underscore what Secretary Cheney said when he came before our committee to submit his budget. He reluctantly submitted the budget because it was driven, because of the budget agreement, to cut, as I have said before, our Nation's defense to the lowest level of the gross national product at any time since 1939. And he underscored that 5 years from now, even if we follow his budget, we will not be able to do what we recently did in the Persian Gulf. He said we had better get it right. That should be pretty terrify-



ing to the next generation. And it is not by their request, it is by the budgetary needs that we are going to be cutting our armed services by 500,000 people. That is a lot of people from each of the 435 congressional districts around the country. And I think you will be hearing from them.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER], a very distinguished member of the committee, who has been out there a long time on this issue.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Colorado. I believe she is the one who coined the term "burden sharing." It is something that makes a lot of sense.

I certainly rise today to support the burden sharing amendments that are about to come before the House by my distinguished colleagues, Mrs. SCHROEDER and Mr. FRANK, others who have offered these amendments, Mr. DORGAN and Mr. BRYANT.

Whoever said that there is no such thing as a free lunch has not analyzed our military budget. Europe and Japan are not only getting a free lunch but a free breakfast and free dinner and two martinis thrown in. I think we have to discuss this because the gentleman from New York repeatedly talked about bashing our allies. I do not believe this is about bashing our allies at all. It has to do with fairness to our people, and it has to do with reality, the reality of today.

It is about this Congress doing its job for our people. That is what burden sharing is about. It is about the Persian Gulf war, when for the first time we asked for reimbursement and we received it. Not quite enough yet.

It is interesting that the gentleman from New York talked about, and I use his phrase, "our comrades who helped us." If you look at what the Japanese did, they sent one paramedic team, who unfortunately left before the conflict broke out. So I think we need to talk about reality and fairness and do the job for our people.

It is crucial that we explain to the American people today—and I, too, appreciate the 4 hours of time in which to do it—the sacrifices they have been making on behalf of our allies.

Since the end of World War II, Americans, American taxpayers, have spent, according to the Rand Institute, \$4 trillion defending NATO from the Warsaw Pact. A very noble sacrifice.

Our national debt is \$3 trillion, and we are now paying interest on that debt. It is the fastest growing item in the budget. Much of it goes to people who do not reside in this country. And this debt is the largest in the world.

Let me show you a chart which will explain what the sacrifice is. This chart shows you the percentage of the

gross national product that we spend on our military compared to our allies whom we are defending. West Germany, 2.9 percent; Japan, 1 percent; Norway—and let me tell you, under the NATO umbrella we are spending \$16 billion to defend the north Norway area—3.2 percent. We are spending 6.3 percent of our gross national product on the military compared to our allies whom we are defending. We spend \$175 billion to protect Europe and \$27 billion to defend Japan.

Now, what has happened to the trade deficit or the trade surplus in these various countries? Obviously, what has happened is that our allies, who have the wherewithal to produce consumer goods and export them, have a healthy surplus. Germany, \$55 billion; Japan, \$57 billion; little Norway, \$7.8 billion. What is our trade surplus? Sad to say, it is a deficit, \$110 billion.

So, in terms of economic health compared to what we spend, we see what countries have a healthier balance of payments. I would like to show the next chart.

You know, I have had the distinct pleasure and responsibility of raising a family, and when my children, who are now in their twenties, were approaching 18, I told them they had to pay their fair way. Maybe it was small at first, now it is getting larger, and hopefully their dad and I will see them be totally self-sufficient.

We have been defending these countries for 40 years, 40 years.

Mr. Chairman, it is time we look at the condition of our allies compared to our condition. Let us look at infant mortality. We have the worst; 10 out of 1,000 infants died. Germany, 8 out of 1,000; Japan, 4 out of 1,000; Norway, 8 out of 1,000.

Life expectancy, we do the worst of all these countries. Percent of the population which is poor, we have 16 percent; Germany, 4.9 percent; Japan's we do not know; Norway, 4.8.

I have one last chart. Percent of population without health insurance. We have 14 percent; Germany, 2 percent; Japan, none; Norway, none.

Percentage of children immunized by age 1, we are failing on this measure. The others immunize practically all their children, and we only immunize about a third of our children.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to tell our allies they are doing better than we are in all of these measures, they have to pay their fair share.

I would tell them what I tell my children: "we love you, we will respond to your calls for help, we will always be there for you, but pay your fair share." It is time, support these burden sharing amendments.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

□ 1250

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished ranking member.

I hope the gentlewoman from California, who preceded me, will join me in a move to get the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to start printing charts. That would provide a tremendous public service. I think someday we could probably find a printing company that could print part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in color. Maybe we could even convince the majority leadership to stop this insulting policy late at night, before the gavel has come down, of trolling an empty Chamber. We do not pan the House during 1-minutes, or at the beginning of the day, or when we are doing committee work here and there are often not many people on the floor.

I dislike the way that camera prowls at night as through we are not talking to anybody. But you know we have an audience of about a million and a half of our fellow Americans during 1-minutes and for special orders at the end of the day and everything in between.

I find the gentlewoman's charts compelling. I find them fair, the kind of thing I like to memorize and keep track of. But to balance the debate and then let the wisdom of the House work its way, let me share some other data. I was very tough on non-European participation at the beginning of Desert Shield and even at the beginning of Desert Storm. By the time Desert Saber hit, with that incredible 100-hour land war, I was pretty well convinced that our allies would come through, we just were waiting for the money to come in. Now it has started to come in, and here is real evidence on our burden sharing, at least in the money department.

Japan has contributed close to \$11 billion and they will end up keeping all of their promises within the next few months. Germany has contributed close to \$6.5 billion. That is \$5.5 billion in direct commitments in addition to the more than \$1 billion already spent to transport and support United States military efforts in the gulf.

I went through several of the German bases like Rhein Main and their support was tremendous. It included the German Red Cross and their Gray Ladies to take care of all of our young men going back and forth. They were there to support us in those big field hospitals if there had been more wounded coming back than there were.

In addition, Germany has made good on the promised military equipment for Turkey. That is anti-aircraft missile launchers and air defense launchers.

Canada, Belgium, and Italy contributed combat aircraft and other support. A couple of those countries did not participate in the ground combat. Canada's F-18's flew in combat out of Bahrain. Belgium and Italy were up in

Turkey, but it was the ACE force, the allied combined expeditionary force we asked to come down to Turkey, wait and see what Saddam's reaction would be. The Prime Minister of Turkey wanted it that way.

Britain deployed approximately 40,000 troops in the gulf. Many of us visited the Desert Rats and the First Armored Brigade of Great Britain. I had the privilege of visiting twice. The British contributed greatly. Ask General Schwarzkopf. The U.K. received pledges of cash from Japan, additional equipment from Germany to help offset the cost.

France fielded ground troops, alongside United States and Arab forces. Their famed Foreign Legion were part of that Hail Mary end sweep around that was the Euphrates River.

With respect to NATO as an entity, please, it is important to keep this in mind—much of the logistics behind the massive airlift campaign, especially of all of our United States forces from Europe, was managed through NATO headquarters. Most of us in this Chamber are not even aware of Operation Proven Force, which was the complementary force to Desert Shield in the north. In total, to finish that thought, most Americans are not even aware of Proven Force. They are aware of Desert Shield, Desert Storm. Not one American out of 100,000, I suspect, knows that Desert Saber was the name for the combat operation, the 100-hour land war.

Then up north in Turkey was Proven Force. This force was mostly made up of U.S. personnel from Europe, particularly our Air Force, USAF, and support from our NATO command.

Here are some other things NATO did. Beside logistics, NATO allies committed some 65,000 men, 70 naval combatant ships, over 250 combat aircraft, 200 tanks. NATO helped maintain the western political cohesion, coalition military efforts throughout the whole 7-month period. NATO provided also an important forum for developing and maintaining consensus for collective and individual national contributions.

Let us not pull back into Fortress America just yet. I cannot see anytime into the next century where we can arbitrarily cut the tens of thousands of numbers we are talking about.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to work under the leadership of the gentlewoman from Colorado on this very central issue. We have been told for some time now that we cannot afford as a nation to do things which almost all of us think are essential. Do more to clean our air. Do more to house our people. Do more to provide medical care. We have retirees of Eastern Air-

lines today being told that they go without medical care because of a bankruptcy.

At the same time we have been told that we should be spending as much to subsidize our wealthy allies today as we did 20 years ago. They have gotten wealthier. The threat has gotten less. And we are told not only that we must keep spending our money on them but even, I am interested in the semantics of all this, that we are bashing them.

This is a new definition of bashing. To bash means to refuse to turn over tens of billions of dollars. In other words, if you are walking home tonight and someone says, I would like your money, and you do not give it to them, you may be denounced tomorrow as a basher.

If we say to our wealthy allies, to Japan, to the Netherlands, to Norway, look, let us share equally in this, we have somehow become bashers.

The issue is not the bash; the issue is the cash. The issue is the hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars we are spending on our wealthy allies.

We were just told, well, but they helped us in Kuwait. They helped hold together the cohesion of NATO. That is very nice, but it does not cost all this much money. But in fact, let us take the Kuwait model and make it work.

Yes, other nations contributed to the defense of Kuwait. The problem is with the mindset in how my friends on the other side decide this. The assumption is that protecting Kuwait, keeping the Communist hordes from coming across into Europe, protecting Japan, that these are American responsibilities and that if any other nation contributes to them, we should be grateful. But if we insist that they contribute, we are bashers.

We have been engaged in two competitions for the last 10 years. We have been the Bo Jackson of the world. We have taken on the Soviets and the military competition, and we have been engaged in the civilian competition against just about everybody else.

The difference is at least Bo Jackson got to play football in one season and baseball in the other. We have had to play against both sets of teams simultaneously.

We have done very well in the military competition. We are not talking about Fortress America. We are not talking about dismantling. If every amendment pending today passed, we would be the strongest nation in the world with the most far-flung overseas military empire in the history of the world.

There is not anything remotely Fortress America about it. What we are saying is, it is time for those who have been the beneficiaries of our military largesse, while they have been our economic competitors, to start to pay a little there.

Bo Jackson hurt his hip playing first baseball and then football. We are getting a triple hernia from playing both on the same day against two different teams.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, the continued strength of the NATO alliance and our role within it remain essential for future peace. As emphasized by Secretary Cheney and General Powell during their testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, the world is changing but it has not changed.

General Powell spoke of four enduring realities:

One, the reality of Soviet military power. The Soviet military threat is being reduced; it has hardly disappeared. The Soviet Union maintains millions of armed men in uniform, and they will remain the strongest military force on the Eurasian continent.

Second, that the United States will continue to have vital interests across the Atlantic. Preserving a free and stable Europe will remain an enduring interest for the United States.

Third, that the United States will continue to have vital interests in the Pacific. General Powell stated, and I quote,

The continuing presence of U.S. combat forces on the Korean Peninsula is essential to bolster deterrence, as well as to promote long-term prospects for a peaceful North-South dialogue.

At the same time, I might add, if progress should fail, the United States force would be required to defeat any attack from North Korea.

□ 1300

Fourth, the world will continue to change. As events become less predictable, it is more important than ever that the United States remain poised to deter regional aggressors and promote stability.

The world remains a very dangerous place, in other words, even in this post-cold war era.

We and our NATO partners are conducting a very thorough review of alliance strategy. It is clear that some changes are in order.

Admiral Jeremia testified before the House Committee on Armed Services that he thought the NATO forward presence would include a heavy Army Corps with at least two divisions, a full-time Navy and Marine presence in the Mediterranean, and Air Force fighter wings possessing the full spectrum of tactical capability.

This amendment would draw our forces down over the next 5 years to below 100,000 troops in Europe. General Galvin, in testimony before this Congress, has said that he intends to pursue a cut of at least one-half, to 60,000, within the next 5 years as well.



So the question is not whether our forces are going to be drawn down; the question is who is going to make those decisions and how are they going to be implemented. Should we leave them to the NATO leaders and our Secretary of Defense, or should we, here in the Congress, micromanage this drawdown?

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford to send the wrong signals to our allies in NATO.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the subcommittee chairman, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], for expressing the sense of Congress that we support NATO. But, by the same token, our actions speak louder than our words if we turn around and micromanage our forces in such a way as to require a drawdown sooner than it is practicable or in ways that our commanders do not think to be desirable.

The question is whether our allies have paid a fair share in the gulf war, and whether they are paying a fair share in other respects. I would remind Members that we appropriated \$15 billion to support the effort in Desert Storm. You know what has happened? Committees of this Congress have expressed the view that the Department of Defense should not spend a nickel of that, because it turns out that our allies will have paid the whole bill. So the Department of Defense should not spend any of it.

Mr. Chairman, I would say if they paid the whole bill for the gulf war, that is pretty good, in terms of burden sharing. Which way is it? I think the fact is that the allies have done well, that we are making good progress on burden sharing, and that we need to continue to do the things that will create progress, rather than pull the rug out from under our allies at this point.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to quote from our committee report, which says, first with respect to Desert Storm, "1990 was a remarkable year for burden sharing." That does not sound so bad.

With regard to more traditional burden sharing, "Last year was also remarkable in terms of more traditional burden sharing." That sounds pretty good.

Real burden sharing progress occurred with Japan and Korea.

Finally, by 1995, current DOD plans call for the elimination of nearly 60 percent of the Army's divisions, and over 60 percent of the tactical fighter wings now stationed in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we are making good progress, and now is not the time to pull the rug out from under our NATO allies or the commanders of our forces who understand how to make this happen in the right way. Let us not play politics with our NATO allies. Let us not play politics with our defense. Let us not micro-manage a process that is working well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote no on these burden-sharing amendments and support the administration.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I grew up in a town of 350 people, and have as a value from that community the notion that you have a responsibility to share. We learned that very early. That is the only way you can get along in a community of 350 people.

The world community is not too different. We should, it seems to me, have a responsibility to share opportunities, burdens, and responsibilities. But since the Second World War there has developed a notion that we would not share the burden of defending the free world. Uncle Sam will take care of it. The good old United States will pay the bill. The American taxpayers are perfectly willing to handle all of this, it is said.

Well, not anymore. You know this term "the new world order"? George Bush uses the term, "the new world order."

Well, I know what we mean by "new world order," at least on this side of the aisle. It is a world order in which others around the world start paying the bills as well.

America cannot afford to pay everybody's bills anymore. This country is choking on debt, and yet, as my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] says, we borrow from Japan to defend France against an attack from Poland. The Poles do not want to fight in France, they want to shop in France.

The fact is, we have got to stop what we are doing and start insisting that others around the world bear their fair share of the burden.

Here is what the United States, its allies, and Japan spent on defense in 1989: \$498 billion. That is what the free world spent on defense.

Do you know what our share was, the good old USA?—61 percent was our responsibility.

Now, I ask my friends on the minority side of the aisle, do you think it is our responsibility to ask the American taxpayers to pay 61 percent of the costs here? Do you really believe that? Do you really believe that those of us who ask our friends to pick up their fair share of the load are bashing our allies, or that we are isolationists? Do you really believe that nonsense?

We are able to trivialize important issues with the speed of light around here. This is an important issue. This country is choking on debt, off track, and in need of relief.

How should it get some relief? We ought to be able to expect the French, the Germans, the Japanese, and, yes, so many others, to start helping pay for part of the cost of defending the free world.

If we are too nervous to ask our friends to ante up, to help share the load, to help carry the burden, to help pay the bill, then I do not know what has happened to well around here.

Mr. Chairman, this is not bashing anybody. It is asking people to bear their fair share of the load. If you really believe that to continue to ask the American taxpayers to pay 61 percent of the bill for the United States, NATO allies, and Japan, is fair for this country and for the American taxpayers, then that is not a new world order that I understand at all. That resembles, it seems to me, the old world order. We pay the troops, we pay the captains, we pay for the cruisers and the carriers, so that the other countries can ship their products overseas, into our marketplace. While their best scientists and engineers are busy building the best toasters, tires, and television sets, or best scientists and engineers are building the ships and planes to keep the sealanes open. So they win in the international marketplace and we lose. That is particularly unfair.

Mr. Chairman, it is time to start standing up for the interests of this country. Let us not be ashamed of that. Let us not be nervous about it. Let us insist on it.

Mr. Chairman, it is not bashing our friends. It is never bashing friends to ask them to pay their bills, and that is what these amendments on the floor would do today.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHUMER].

Mr. Chairman, we are, of course, still engaged in a great global economic competition. But the one thing that those who oppose these amendments fail to realize is that the ground rules have shifted. The playing ground has shifted.

We all want to keep America No. 1, but the only way we are going to keep America No. 1 is if we prevail economically. No longer is the sine qua non of American power military and diplomatic, but it is economic. History has shown us that great countries of the world, such as our own, inevitably decline if relative to their competitors they spend more on the military and less on keeping their country economically and socially sound.

That is what is happening to America today. Every dollar that we spend on a troop in Japan that is not spent on educating our children, on building our infrastructure, or improving the health of our citizens, or improving the kind of factories that we have, is \$1 dollar lost in our economic battle to stay No. 1.

So I say to Members, this is not a debate of priorities, this is not a debate of people's ideological concerns. This is a debate of raw economic necessity. We will no longer be able to do Operation Desert Storms, we will no longer be able to have the kind of military power we need, unless we get our economy strong, unless we have a broad enough economic base to support the kind of military strength that many Members correctly said we need.

Mr. Chairman, It is a sum zero game. Does Japan pay? Does Korea pay? Does Germany pay? Or does the American economy pay? It is that simple.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BATEMAN].

Mr. BATEMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is really not a debate about whether or not the American military presence in Europe, Korea, Japan, or elsewhere, is going to decline or should decline. It is a given of anyone familiar with the subject matter we are discussing that that is indeed going to happen. Any member on the Committee on Armed Services that has bothered to talk to our military leadership knows that our forces stationed in Europe are going to be substantially reduced. They are programmed to be substantially reduced.

□ 1310

We also can contemplate that there will be substantial reductions in the forces deployed on the Korean Peninsula.

But I would suggest to my colleagues that I would rather have our military leadership, pursuant to a coherent plan and consistent with our treaty, and working relationships with our allies, to effectuate this drawdown and reduction of forces rather than to have us do it without plan, without any coherence, without any real basis for doing it other than rhetoric that suggests that we do not think our allies share enough of the burden.

I am sensitive to the matter of whether or not they do or do not, but if we are going to be sensitive to the matter and realistic about the matter instead of being demagogic and political about the matter, we must understand that we, politically elected representatives in this Congress, cannot be the final arbiter of what is a fair sharing of the burden. That cannot be done unilaterally by us, politically by us. It is something that has to be worked out in the community of alliances that we have formed throughout the world over the last 40 years.

I would urge our colleagues to let the history of the change in our strategic circumstances effectuate the drawdown in our commitments overseas, as certainly they are going to do, but let us let the General Schwarzkopfs and the General Galvins, who have led us very

brilliantly in their development of strategy and in their formulation of the most effective and successful alliance in history, and I speak specifically of the NATO Alliance, let us leave it to them. Let us not do this on a purely politicized basis.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DOWNEY].

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Colorado for yielding me the time, and also thank her for her fine leadership on this matter.

At the beginning of the atomic age the great physicist, Albert Einstein, said that after the explosion of nuclear weapons everything in the world had changed except our thinking. As I listen to some of our colleagues, I think that is appropriate with respect to the end of the cold war. Nothing appears to have changed in their minds in terms of what the United States should be doing to defend Europe; yet, everything has in fact changed. Witness the fact that just last year the Germans, the West Germans then, paid the Russians, paid the Russians \$7 billion to relocate Soviet forces back in the Soviet Union.

Historically, our troops in Europe were designed to repel a Soviet invasion of Western Europe. I think it is fair to say that that threat has been dramatically reduced, if the number of our bases, the number of our force commitment has not been commensurately reduced.

This is not a question of if we should ultimately reduce our burden of defending the world, but rather a question of when. What the gentlewoman from Colorado and others will be saying in the next few hours of debate is that the time has come now for us to reduce this commitment. Why? All Members need to recognize if they compare just the United States and Europe for the rates of child poverty in the United States and Western Europe, we are much higher; the rates of illiteracy, we are much worse off. In math and reasoning skills, we are 11th in the world, far behind for our children compared to those children of Western Europe.

The money that we would save by gradually reducing our commitment is not enough to deal with immediate problems. We need to change that commitment more dramatically and do it now, because the problems in the United States are dramatic and urgent. They need our immediate attention.

Last, let me just say a word about the United States as a global power. Nobody here seeks to change that. Nobody here believes for a moment that we will not have important international commitments or that we should in any way think about ignoring those commitments.

The question is how do we help America the fastest.

The Schroeder way, the Barney Frank way is the way to do it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me the time.

Let me tell Members what troubles me about the debate. I guess I kind of feel like there is a whole heck of a lot of politics involved in this debate, and that is what I dislike the most about this, trying to get on the record for saying we are trying to get more out of our allies.

First of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Colorado, who has been a fighter for the issue of burden sharing for a long time. In fact, I think in some respects it is good that our colleagues in the House of Representatives want to beat the living daylights out of our allies, because what we really want is we want them to do more for us. We want them to do more for themselves so that the cost of being a superpower to the United States, in a military way, is somewhat reduced so that we as a superpower cannot only be a superpower militarily, but we can also be a superpower economically.

One of the things we learned postcold war is just because you have missiles and bombs does not make you a superpower. Just take a look at the Soviet Union. They may be a superpower militarily, but they are deteriorating because their economic circumstances are so terrible. That is why it does not make sense for the United States and some of our colleagues in the House to beat our allies around the world over the head and say do more for yourself so that we do not have to keep doing as much for everybody.

I do not have any objection to that. In fact, I have been involved in beating them up myself for a time. But I think it is fair to say today, in May 1991, following the lessons of Desert Storm, that we did pretty well in terms of putting a coalition together of countries that were willing to stick their necks way out, not only politically but with their own troops and with a heck of a lot of money.

I was not personally happy that the Japanese and the Germans were not out in the gulf. But we have to be very careful when we consider lifting the restrictions on the Japanese and the Germans. The bottom line here is we did pretty well in the desert, and to try and get the Japanese and the Germans to go out in the desert with their military forces I think has profound consequences that we are not prepared to decide today.

Yes, I would have liked to have seen Japanese and German medical personnel out in the gulf, and maybe a debate like this will convince the White House



to make pushes like that if we ever have to go into a war again.

That gets back, of course, to the question of whether we learned any lessons from this war, and I am sad to say I do not think we have learned as many as we ought to about preventing the next war. But presume that we go again, certainly we would want to have the German and the Japanese medical people involved.

But the bottom line is in May 1991 we are doing a pretty good job, and most of these amendments that we have on the floor today really are—I mean they are political in nature. Members want to make a statement, and maybe it is fine for people in the House to make a statement. But I think if we want to be intellectually honest we should recognize the fact that America is a superpower, that we were able to put together the most incredible coalition that we have ever seen in modern history, and we ought to just cool it on all of this political rhetoric right now. I mean we are getting carried away with this.

Do I have any particular objections to the Schroeder amendment? No, but we have Schroeder, we have Bryant, we have 15,000 amendments that are designed to beat up our allies. And I think before we beat them up we ought to take a little bit of time and realize where we are. We are a superpower. We do have responsibilities, and the whole world thanks America for what it has been able to do.

So, yes, I want to make sure we get them to do more. But let us cool the politics, folks, and be statesmen up here.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDESON].

Mr. GEJDESON. Mr. Chairman, the world changes, and those who do not change become extinct like the dinosaurs.

At the beginning of World War II we were adversaries with Germany and American soldiers liberated Europe and the entire world.

When I was born in Germany in 1948, it was a country devastated by war. Its buildings were destroyed.

□ 1320

Its economy was in shambles, and for the United States in a humanitarian gesture to turn to help Germany and its people to recover made a lot of sense.

We are not 50 years after that date, 43 years after the date that I was born in the displaced-person camp in Germany. The Germans are now beating us in every economic competition, and it would be as if two competing stores, one sending a check to the other, and the United States subsidizes the German economy, stimulates the German economy by the presence of 224 military bases.

If we look at what happened to the colonial powers of France and England as they tried to hang on to their colonies long after it made economic sense, it brought them crashing down, and if the United States does not reappraise its priorities and shift the dollars to where they need them to make our economy more competitive, to make our students able to go to college without debt, to give us a national standard for health care for all Americans, then like the colonial British and French powers, we will decimate the strength of this country. We will no longer have the economic capability to carry forward either foreign or economic policies to lead the free world.

Two hundred twenty-four bases in Germany while the Germans send \$7 billion to the Russians makes no sense at all. If the United States saw one of its major corporations sending checks to the Japanese corporations, we would think they were nuts.

That is what we are doing here with a massive infusion of American dollars in the European economy.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to all the debate, and I know it is sophisticated and we like the American people to think everything is so real delicate and highly intellectual that it is hard to understand. But actually it is not. Let me see if I could try and figure this out after some 6½ years.

This year we have a \$320 billion deficit in America. So what do we do about it? We are going to close military bases in America. We are going to leave open the bases overseas. We are going to close the bases in America.

Now, let me tell you how we get this money. We borrow money from Japan and Germany to finance our debt. Then we give the borrowed money that we get from Japan and Germany to finance our debt back to Japan and Germany and Korea in the form of defense services.

Their economies are robust. They have no debts. They have very little defense costs. We pay for their defense. We are going bankrupt.

Meanwhile, Congress is borrowing money from Social Security, cutting housing, cutting education.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is stupid. Congress either needs a brain transplant or a proctologist to repair what brains are left.

I recommend that we start putting Japan, Germany, Korea, and everybody else on pay-as-you-go basis. Uncle Sam will continue to be Uncle Sam, not Uncle Sucker.

If you really want to get frosted, most of these countries practice illegal trade to boot and take American's jobs. I, for the life of me, ladies and gentlemen, cannot understand it.

Mr. Chairman, I am just simply going to say as an individual who comes from a district that lost 55,000 steelmaking jobs, why do you not listen to what the American people are saying? They are saying, "We are tired of the foreign pork. We are tired of the military welfare overseas." Why do you not take care of the people in America and let the people overseas take care of themselves? Help them out, send them a bill, and let them pay for our services, because every time they are in a fix, we end up saving their assets anyway.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN PRO TEMPORE

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. POSHARD). The Chair would remind the visitors in the gallery that any show of approval or disapproval is prohibited in the gallery.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, over the course of the last 8 years, it has been my privilege to serve on the Military Construction Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services.

It is a pleasure to report to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that on the issue of burden sharing over the course of the last 4 years in particular we have come a long way, getting our partners around the world to pick up a larger and larger share of the defense burden. I think that is only appropriate.

It is interesting to note in looking at the testimony before our subcommittee and, indeed, the subcommittee's opening statements of last year were pointing out that Japan as being the standard by which we ought to judge other nations in that in recent years they have come a long way in host-nation support.

The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] and myself, as a matter of fact, were in Japan and Korea on this specific issue not long ago. I will take a second seat to no one as far as laying out in no uncertain terms to them what I felt and what we felt are their duties as far as supporting not only Desert Storm and Desert Shield but defense throughout the world.

I would like to make one point for those who say that, "Why did not Japan have a bigger and bigger share?" Well, we put a limitation on the amount that they can spend in their defense budget.

I want to let the Members know that in the Pacific Rim in particular memories die hard, and if the Japanese today were deciding whether they would go with 10, 11, or 12 carrier battle groups, I do not think that you would get a consensus of opinion around the world as to how much they ought to participate.

The good news is we have come a long way. Indeed, we have a long way to go, but let us do that through negotiations that have been so successful in

recent years about getting our allies to carry a larger share of the defense burden.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, a little bit later today we are going to be considering the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] which would set a ceiling of no more than 30,000 American troops that can be deployed in the Republic of Korea.

As it is, the administration is currently planning to reduce the size of our military deployment in South Korea down to 37,000. So the difference between the Mrazek amendment and the administration's own policy comes down to a difference of 7,000 troops.

I think it would be a mistake for us at this time to adopt the Mrazek amendment. It is not at all clear what objectives it is designed to serve. If the purpose is to save money, it should be clear that unless the 7,000 additional troops his amendment would require us to withdraw are demobilized, that not only will not save us any money but it might cost us money because if those troops have to be redeployed, for example, in the United States where South Korea would not be contributing to their upkeep as they do in the Republic of Korea, the ultimate charge to the taxpayer would be more rather than less.

But the main reason I think it would be a mistake to adopt the Mrazek amendment is that it could lend itself to misinterpretation by North Korea at a time when the North Koreans still have three-quarters of a million men under arms, at a time when they have not abandoned their determination to reunify the Korean Peninsula under Communist control, at a time when no one can preclude the possibility of another act of aggression by North Korea against South Korea.

The last thing we want to do intentionally or unintentionally is to send a signal to Pyongyang that we might be in the process of withdrawing eventually all of our forces from South Korea. That would diminish deterrence. It would diminish whatever incentive the North Koreans have to make concessions in the ongoing North-South dialog that could contribute to a reduction of tensions on the Korean Peninsula.

So for the relatively minimal and elusive benefits that could be gained if the Mrazek amendment is adopted, we have to compare it to the potentially serious consequences that could result if it passed. I, therefore, urge the defeat, when it comes up later, of the Mrazek amendment.

□ 1330

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if Members are concerned about the future of America, if Members are concerned as to whether our Nation will be competitive, if Members view with some alarm the imports coming into this Nation, taking away American jobs, pay close attention to this debate.

We have heard said from the Republican side of the aisle that we have a responsibility as a superpower. I admit that that is true. However, consider what that responsibility means.

When it comes to Japan today, for every dollar paid in tax by a Japanese citizen for the defense of his nation, the American citizen pays \$5. For every dollar paid in tax by a citizen living in one of our NATO allied countries in Europe, the American taxpayer pays \$2. We are assuming a greater and greater defense burden, not just for the defense of America, but for the defense of our allies.

What do they do with the difference? They invest it in their country. They put it into their health care. They put it into education. They build bullet trains. They build universities. They build plants that send products to this country, that put Americans out of work. And citizens wonder what this debate is about. It is about the future of a superpower.

When one of our NATO colleagues was asked a few months ago why they did not pay more, he said, "Excuse me. The United States wants to be the military superpower. We just want to be an economic superpower."

What is in the best interest of the future of the United States? It is having a vibrant, growing economy, an economy where our children can get jobs out of college, an economy that provides opportunity that America has always stood for. That is what this debate is all about.

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, I respect the opinions of my colleagues who firmly support more burden sharing from our allies. I concur partially, but my colleagues are being unfair in the case of Japan.

I want to put some balance into the debate in support of the Japanese. For instance, Japan has pledged nearly \$11 billion toward the cost of Operation Desert Storm, most of which has been paid.

It is popular to bash Japan on a large number of issues, and I admit that there is some justification. However, we should keep in mind that there are some very positive benefits which America derives from our friendly association with Japan. The United States has 40,000 Marines in Okinawa and a heavy presence of Navy, Air Force, and Army personnel.

Many Americans are not aware that Japan provides almost all of the costs associated with military construction at United States military facilities there, which consists of housing,

hangars, and airport runways. On January 14, 1991, Secretary Baker signed a new 5-year host nation support agreement with Japan's Foreign Minister.

Over 5 years, it will add \$1.7 billion to Japan's annual payments in support of United States forces in Japan in host nation support each year, by far the largest of any United States ally.

In fact, just this year Japan has agreed to pay all of the energy costs which our presence will require.

I agree that it is to Japan's advantage that we have a presence in the Pacific. But it is also to America's advantage that we, as a world power, have a presence there.

The fact is that without the Japanese burden-sharing support we could not have 40,000 Marines in Okinawa to offset the North Korean threat as well as another unexpected Desert Storm type threat which might occur.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the series of burden-sharing amendments before the House.

The Persian Gulf war produced an unprecedented level of cooperation from countries all over the world. The coalition members contributed their equipment, their money, and their men and women. This cooperation led to unparalleled success on the battlefield. Unfortunately, our allies have been less willing to contribute to our mutual defense during peacetime.

The current force structure in Europe and Japan was designed after World War II when those countries were incapable of defending themselves. The situation is drastically different today. Today, we have a massive budget deficit but we continue to fund the military defense of our major economic competitors. Yes, the presence of our troops abroad contributes to our own security through deterrence. Yes, we originally wanted to prevent Japan and Germany from having strong militaries. But this is 1991, not 1941. We can no longer afford to finance the defense of our allies to the extent that we have for the last 40 years.

It would be wonderful if our allies simply decided to contribute more to our mutual defense. But that is never going to happen. If we want our allies to share more of the cost of their defense, then we have to pay less of it. I find it ridiculous that we are currently paying for American troops in Germany while Germany is paying for the Soviet troops we are protecting them from. It makes no sense, but if we are willing to do it, why should Germany object? We must show our allies that we are no longer willing to have American tax dollars pay for the defense burden they should assume. I urge my colleagues to vote to encourage greater burden sharing.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. POSHARD). It is now in order to consider the amendments relating to burden sharing printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68, by, and if offered by, the following Members or their designees, which shall be considered in the following order:

By Representative SCHROEDER;

By Representatives FRANK of Massachusetts, DURBIN, GEJDENSON, or BRYANT;



By Representative DORGAN of North Dakota;

By Representative BRYANT; and

By Representative MRAZEK.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

For what purpose does the gentlewoman from Colorado rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. SCHROEDER

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. SCHROEDER: At the end of title X (page 180, after line 8), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1033. SENSE OF THE CONGRESS REGARDING UNITED STATES COMMITMENT TO NATO.**

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the United States has a strong interest in continuing and strengthening the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) to preserve world peace and security and to aid in the transition to a Europe that is whole and free;

(2) the United States should work with its NATO allies to adapt NATO to better respond to the changing world situation, which includes—

(A) the elimination of the threat posed to western Europe by the nations of the Warsaw Pact (other than the Soviet Union);

(B) the reduction in the threat of attack on western Europe posed by the Soviet Union; and

(C) the reduction in the amount of financial resources that the United States is able to devote to defense spending; and

(3) the United States should reduce the number of United States troops permanently stationed in Europe to less than 100,000 by fiscal year 1995 and organize the remaining troops to facilitate the rapid and large-scale reception of reinforcing United States troops in the event of a military necessity.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and a Member opposed, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, In April 1985, Mikhail Gorbachev became Chairman of the Soviet Communist Party. In December 1987, Gorbachev signed the INF Treaty eliminating an entire class of nuclear weapons. In December 1988, Gorbachev told the United Nations that the Warsaw Pact nations were free to go their own way. On November 8, 1989, the Berlin Wall fell. A year later, the two Germanys became one. Today, many of the most powerful republics within the Soviet Union are threatening to secede from the union. The Soviet Union has lost its will and most of its capability to threaten Western Europe. The stark

reality is that NATO's raison d'être has largely evaporated. Perhaps the strongest peacetime military alliance among democratic alliance among democratic States in history suddenly has no reason to exist.

Some say it is time to sweep NATO off the world stage. They say the future of NATO is about as bright as that of the Holy Roman Empire or the Hapsburg dynasty. I do not share that view. Rather, I believe that NATO has a vital role to play in creating a new Europe which is truly whole and free. And, such a Europe is in our interest: such a Europe promotes democracy, human rights, and worldwide economic prosperity. Too much American blood has poured on European soil for us to permit Europe to backslide into regional and ethnic conflict and into autocratic rule.

My sense-of-Congress resolution starts off with the clear statement that the United States has a strong interest in continuing and strengthening NATO to preserve world peace and security and to aid in the transition to a Europe that is whole and free. My amendment provides a ringing endorsement for NATO.

It goes on to talk about the changes in the world to which NATO must adapt. The first change is that the Warsaw Pact is gone forever. Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania, and Hungary will never again serve as forward bases for Soviet troops. And each of these countries is moving away from autocratic marxism to more market based economies. None of these societies can feed their people and maintain an aggressive army under a market economy. Certainly there are worrisome trends in some of these countries: particularly Bulgaria and Romania. But these worrisome trends pose no military threat to Western Europe.

The second change is that the Soviet Union lacks both the will and the means to attack Western Europe. The Soviet Union does still have a large military and serious nuclear weapons. Still, a conventional attack would require a logistical base and access through the old Warsaw Pact countries of a level inconceivable today. Some military planners talk of years of warning time. Effectively, that means that the Soviet army would have to start from scratch in mounting an attack. And it is hard to dream up a reason that the Soviets might think to start a conflict. As for the Soviet nuclear capability, we have made clear that our nuclear umbrella covers Europe. Any Soviet nuclear attack on Western Europe would be met by a devastating American nuclear response. That is as true today as it was a decade ago.

The third change is the declining U.S. defense budget. For the last decade, the United States has spent more

than 6 percent of its gross national product on defense. Under the budget summit agreement, that figure will drop to 4 percent. Clearly, the United States military will be able to do less. We can, however, meet our global commitments. We can effectively project combat power through an active program of dual basing, whereby troops are assigned to U.S. bases and forward deploy for exercises or training. Last year, Congress told the administration to study and implement the concept of dual basing. Unfortunately, the administration has failed even to file the required report on time. It seems the Pentagon is so steeped in its tradition of building American cities abroad that it is incapable of even considering dual basing. And the taxpayers are the losers.

Another way we can keep our global commitments is to have our allies really assume some of the common defense burden. I am not talking about a little more host nation support. In the new world of diffused threats, our NATO partners can assume complete responsibility for the territorial integrity of Europe, they can assume responsibility for maintaining and supplying bases which might be needed for American reinforcement, they can assume the maritime patrol role, and they can assume a real role in dealing with out-of-area threats. We will maintain responsibility for freedom of navigation, nuclear protection, strategic intelligence, and strategic deterrence. This sort of new division of responsibility makes sense in the new world and is required by the cuts in the American defense budget.

Obviously, we cannot make our allies deal with threats which they do not believe are real. So, prior to reaching a division of responsibilities, we and our NATO allies must reach a consensus on the threat.

This brings me to the last sense of Congress provision contained in my amendment. It states that the United States should reduce the number of its troops in Europe to less than 100,000 by fiscal year 1995 and those troops should be organized for reception of reinforcing troops in a crisis. Since 1952, the United States has had stationed over 300,000 troops in Europe. During the Korean war and the Berlin airlift, the number briefly breached 400,000. During the period of détente in the early seventies, the number slipped below 300,000. As the chart behind me shows, since 1983, the number since 1983 has remained flat at around 325,000. Not the accession of Gorbachev, not the INF treaty, not the end of the Warsaw Pact, not the falling of the Berlin Wall, not the unification of Germany, not the disintegration of the Soviet Union has effected our troop level.

This trend is directly at odds with what the administration has been saying. We have heard President Bush talk

about real declines in U.S. troops in Europe. We have heard about a new strategy for NATO. We have watched as the two Germanys have united and as the German Government is spending tens of billions of dollars to buy houses for the Soviet soldiers left behind. And, this refusal to reduce troop levels in Europe comes at the same time that the Secretary of Defense has proposed that three dozen major U.S. bases be closed.

The fact is that our 300,000 troops in Europe face no threat, have no enemy, have no doctrine, can prepare for no battle. It is time to start removing them.

Why does my amendment provide 100,000 as the limit? Frankly, because that is the number which mainstream thinkers on both sides of the Atlantic have proposed. A distinguished working group, chaired by former Defense Secretary Harold Brown and former Treasury Secretary William Simon, and including such participants as Norm Augustine, Zbigniew Brzezinski, Andrew Goodpaster, Shy Meyer, SAM NUNN, and Rozanne Ridgway, arrived at the "less than 100,000" figure. Indeed, my entire amendment is based on the report of that group.

Frankly, I think 100,000 is far too many. I believe we should retain intelligence, liaison, and reception forces in Europe and rotate dual based combat troops for short-term assignments. Under this formula, the number of permanently based troops would be 15,000 to 25,000, while perhaps four of the active Army divisions would rotate through for end-to-end 6 month deployments. That would mean that we would have a two corps combat strength, ready for rapid deployment, and about 20,000 combat troops actually in Europe at any given time.

My amendment is needed for two reasons. First, the administration is dawdling on reducing troops in Europe. Plans were made last summer but were put on the shelf during the gulf war. Since then, the turtle-like planning process has started again. Without a push from Congress, DOD will find a hundred reasons why the drawdown has to go slowly.

Second, General Galvin, the commander of U.S. forces in Europe, has told the Armed Service Committee that he is aiming for a force of about 165,000 in 1995. This number is far higher than justified by the threat and far higher than the budget can support. Congress should set the goal at less than 100,000 to tell General Galvin that his plans are too modest.

The administration raises a number of objections to my amendment. First, the administration says we are negotiating troop reductions with the Soviets. For Congress to mandate a number would be to give the Soviets free what they would have to pay for at the negotiating table. The problem with this ar-

gument is that it is 3 years old. A year ago, our negotiators in Vienna stopped negotiating on troop levels in the CFE process, figuring that limits on equipment would drive limits on troops. And the Soviets have been unilaterally and rapidly reducing its forces in what used to be the Warsaw Pact. These reductions have not always been orderly and have not always been voluntary. But the notion of mutual and balanced force reductions in Europe is ancient history.

Second, the administration says going below 165,000 would force the commander of European forces to choose between a defensive combat capability and reception capability. My question is where is the commander going to place defensive combat capability. On the inner-German border? It doesn't exist. There is no threat against which defensive combat capability is needed. My amendment doesn't force a choice. It states that reception is the primary mission.

Third, the administration says the basic force should consist of a corps with two combat divisions, three or so tactical fighter wings, and maritime forces. The administration claims that this force cannot be maintained at less than 100,000. Funny, the last time I looked, a division has 17,000 soldiers and a tactical fighter wing has about 5,000 uniformed personnel. So, this basic force would eat up 49,000 troops, leaving another 51,000 for reception, intelligence, liaison, and the all important echelon above corps.

The administration next argues that at the level of 100,000 the United States would lack the ability to deploy forces from Europe for out-of-area contingencies. The fact is that, with the exception of Desert Shield, we lack that ability with 325,000 troops. Even in Desert Shield, the deployments during August, September, and October all came from the United States because we were either afraid to ask or our NATO allies said "no" to the idea of deploying U.S. forces from Europe. The reality is that stationing troops in Europe is the single worst way to have troops ready to deploy for conflicts outside Europe.

Finally, the administration argues that a force of 100,000 does not give us a credible military and political force. Sometimes a little reality check is worthwhile. One hundred thousand is two and half times the number of troops we have in Korea. It is about one-third the size of the entire German Army or the entire British Army. It is a massive number of troops. And, given the performance of the U.S. military in the Persian Gulf, it is highly credible.

The conclusion is simple. We can continue to support NATO with a substantially smaller troop presence. The threat and the national debt drive us to lower forces. Yet, the administration would rather cut deeply at home

than make necessary cuts in Europe. That is why we need to pass this amendment.

□ 1340

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while we meet here on the floor, we have committee meetings going on and Members of the House doing very important business in their offices, being with constituents and their advisers or whatever. I would hope that those who are watching this in their offices would take particular notice to pay attention to the remarks made on both sides of this issue, as this indeed will be the extent of the consideration that this is given by Congress.

This amendment was not offered in the Subcommittee on Military Construction. It was not offered before the full committee, only here on the floor.

Some might raise the question as to why 100,000 troops. I will have to answer, I have no idea. Apparently this was recommended by an outside study group, Johns Hopkins I guess, or as near as I can determine. We did not have the opportunity to ask them how they arrived at this figure. Why not 90,000 or 110,000 or 5,000 or 200,000? I have no idea.

It would be appropriate for General Galvin to have come before our committee and comment on it.

At the height of the cold war, we had something on the order of 300,000 troops in Europe. Since the Warsaw Pact has come apart, since the Berlin Wall has come down, I see no earthly reason for having that number of troops there, nor does General Galvin, President Bush, or anyone else.

If you just walked by and heard the start of this debate, you might think that is their position, and it certainly is not. We are negotiating a CFE agreement. General Galvin talks about having it reduced to 165,000 over the same timeframe, and indeed over the past year it was the goal to reduce by 40,000 or 50,000 troops, but as you recall a war intervened.

As I pointed out on the floor before, those are troops. They are Americans, men and women, red-blooded Americans. They are not widgets. It takes some time on an orderly basis to determine what the force structure is going to look like in Europe over the next few years, and troops are returning as they should return. But where the 100,000 comes from beats me.

I would say that you could pick any other figure and it would be given no more consideration than this was given in the subcommittee and the full committee.

With that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time.



Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MCCRERY].

Mr. MCCRERY. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a lot of talk this morning about burden sharing, about how much our allies are not contributing, how much the United States is contributing, how folks over there do not know the meaning of college tuition, they do not know the meaning of health care premiums. They do know the meaning of socialism, though, and many of them are running from that philosophy toward our free market approach. I would hope that this Congress would not run in the other direction.

In the 1930's, Germany and Japan spent more of their GNP on defense than the United States. Shall we return to those days? I think not.

Under the terms of the current budget agreement, the United States is due to reduce our defense expenditures to 3.6 percent of GNP, roughly what some of our European allies spend today on their defense.

We are headed in the right direction. Let us not stampede.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Schroeder amendment. While on its face the Schroeder amendment appears to be NATO friendly, its effects are anything but.

If the program outlined by this amendment were put into operation, the United States would be forced to reduce its forces in Europe below 100,000 by 1995 and to restructure its remaining European forces:

To facilitate the rapid and large-scale reception of reinforcing United States troops in the event of a military necessity.

In other words, not only would we be required to reduce our troops levels in excess of 30,000 below that the U.S. commander in chief in Europe, Gen. John Galvin, has said would be prudent, but in addition the remaining forces would be constituted primarily of combat service support personnel who would be of little utility in deterring an attack in Europe or elsewhere.

Proponents of this amendment claim the administration has failed to come to terms with the need for a reduced U.S. force in Europe in light of the collapse of the Warsaw Pact and the demise of communism in Eastern Europe. This assertion is false.

In point of fact, the administration has underscored time and again its commitment to reducing the U.S. troops presence in Europe commensurate with the declining threat of a short notice Warsaw Pact attack on Western Europe. The administration has also said, however, that the number of U.S. troops in Europe cannot be permitted to fall below that required to sustain a credible and stabilizing force presence.

As evidence of this, I would remind my colleagues that General Galvin, in testimony before the House Armed

Services Committee, called for a credible corps, which could be approximately half the size of U.S. Forces presently stationed in Europe. Furthermore, the general believes that we could reduce to around 3¼ tactical air wings in the coming years. That is morning in the right direction, but it is doing it in a rational manner.

The bottom line is this: Today over 260,000 U.S. troops are stationed in Europe. General Galvin has testified that that number will be cut in half over the next 4 years. That is a substantial cut—one which puts the lie to the assertions that the Bush administration has no plans to reduce the level of U.S. troops in Europe.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a no vote on the Schroeder amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity. I have great respect for my colleague who just spoke to this House, the gentleman from Louisiana, but I would like to follow through on an example that was used earlier by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, to talk about the ridiculous state of affairs in America today when we continue to fund the defense of Japan and Europe.

The chart that has been presented here on the floor indicates when the Berlin Wall came down, when the threat of a Communist invasion from the Eastern European powers into Western Europe virtually disintegrated. Look at the trend line in terms of the cutbacks in troops. It did not happen.

Now, the thing that is ironic that was brought up earlier by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT], is the fact that the United States with its budget deficit borrows billions and billions of dollars from Japan and Germany because of our debt, so that we can then take those borrowed funds and go and spend them in Japan and Germany to fund their national defense.

The gentlewoman from Colorado has an amendment here to cut back on our troop strength. It is long overdue. She has been fighting this battle for many years, and I salute her. Today she should win. She should win because World War II is over and the party is over.

It is time for the United States and policymakers in this Chamber to recognize it.

Now, the thing that my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, did not mention and is often brought up by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] is that in Germany today we have this irony. We are maintaining bases and thousands of troops nominally to defend Germany against an attack from the Communists, at the same time that the German Govern-

ment is paying the Soviet Union for leaving its troops in East Germany and not taking them home.

□ 1350

Try to figure that one out. Try to explain to the people of the United States how we are in this predicament, borrowing money from Germany to spend money to defend Germany against an enemy which Germany is subsidizing. Does this make any sense whatsoever? Yet we have this continuing on year after year with vague promises from the Pentagon that some day they are going to take care of it.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is pointing out that West Germany, or now the new unified Germany, is doing burden sharing with the Soviet troops, is that correct?

Mr. DURBIN. That is exactly right.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. And what amount of money is that?

Mr. DURBIN. I do not have an exact figure on that as to how much is being spent. But if one Germany deutsche mark is being sent to Moscow, and there is certainly more than that being sent, consider the irony: That we are sending American dollars over there to supposedly defend Germany against Moscow. Does that make any sense whatsoever? It is time for us to wake up and realize America's priorities demand that we spend money in America. The amendment which the gentlewoman from Colorado offers, the amendment which I will offer later in these proceedings, basically says that it is time for us to realize we are not dealing with bomb-devastated Germany nor bomb-devastated Japan. We are dealing with economies that are strong, that are competing and no longer need this American subsidy.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, our colleague from Colorado, the subcommittee chairman, began this debate by saying that this was about saving megabucks and gigabucks. What I would like to know is how many American dollars are we going to be saving as a result of this amendment? How many bucks?

Because we have heard the testimony, uncontradicted, from General Galvin that he plans to reduce our force structure approximately in half from its current level of 260,000. That is about 130,000.

The amendment of the gentlewoman from Colorado would cut it down to 100,000. That is a difference of 30,000 troops. Now, where is the savings of

gigabucks or megabucks in reducing our strength by 30,000 troops? Particularly, where is that savings if these troops are not going to be demobilized but simply returned to the United States to be stationed here for some other function at the continuing cost that it requires to maintain those troops?

In other words, where is the savings in this? We talk about burden sharing, but I am not sure that there is a clear understanding of the dollar savings that would result from the amendment of the gentleman from Colorado as opposed to the plan that General Galvin has already spoken about.

I will yield to the gentleman from Colorado in a moment, certainly, because it is a question that needs to be answered. The question is this—and I will pose two questions at once: The 100,000 is a purely arbitrary number. How many divisions and wings, Army divisions and air wings, do we assume will be comprised within that 100,000? We should not pick an arbitrary number, it seems to me, but rather allow the commanders in the field to determine what makes sense within that general range. Maybe it is 120,000, maybe it is 98,000; who knows exactly what the exact figure would be?

I would ask the gentleman if she has formulated a plan which would tell us exactly how many troops of each kind are going to be there to comprise this exact round number of 100,000. Why is that the right number as opposed to, let us say, 130,000?

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KYL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would read the amendment, first of all what it says is that it is a sense of the Congress resolution and we are looking at 1995. Basically, we are asking the Defense Department to speed up their projected plans. As the gentleman points out, General Galvin talks about 165,000; we think 100,000 is more than adequate because of all these different groups that have looked at it. And if anything, it may be high.

Normally, if you decommissioned those troops, if you decommission, we figure we save about \$50,000 per troop decommissioned. If they are redeployed in the United States, then you still save money because it is much cheaper to keep them here.

One of the other factors is now much of the infrastructure in Europe we can cut back on for those additional 65,000 troops? As the gentleman knows, we keep opening filling stations, we have got schools, we have got a much more expensive infrastructure over there for every troop than we do if we have troops in the United States.

So it really does end up being a phenomenal saving.

Finally, as you know, treaties require us to use foreign people on each of those bases, and we must pay them in their own currency. That is all figured out on a formula so that you can crank that down too. So we can crank down the civilians overseas, we crank down the foreign workers, and crank down the facilities, and there is a tremendous savings.

Mr. KYL. All right. I would like the gentleman to answer the second question, which was: What exactly is it, what force will we have that comprises this 100,000? I would appreciate it if the gentleman would answer that question on her own time because the fact that 100,000 sounds like a good number, that it should be more than adequate, does not answer the question.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to answer the gentleman's question.

I think if you look at it, it is very easy. We are talking about what do we have for 100,000? Well, we have about 2½ times the number of people that we have in Korea. So, I mean, You can start with that; that is an awful lot of people.

Now, you can argue about how many people you are going to have in a division, in a tactical fighter wing, on and on and on. But it seems to me that if we are making a commitment of about 2½ times what we made for Korea and when we are talking about it 5 years from now, that it is a very adequate number. And it is not like we are leaving them bare.

Second, if you put that European alliance together, they have more people than we do, numerically, in that population, and they have a higher standard of living than we do among their population. Therefore, I think 100,000 looks like our fair share today, whereas in the past, when those numbers were different, it was different.

So I really think this fits 1995 much better.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFNER). Would the gentleman withhold?

The Chair would like to announce the time remaining. The gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 8 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 9 minutes remaining.

Does the gentleman from New York seek time?

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois. He talks about the peculiar situation in Germany, one that nobody could feel intellectually good about, and I certainly would not defend.

Although I must tell you, I saw Helmut Kohl out here walking across the Capitol today. Mr. Kohl, of course, has been pelted with eggs and fruit in his own country because of the problems with reunification.

Nobody justified the fact that the Germans are going to be having to pay the Soviets to keep their forces there and then, in an effort to get them out, the Germans buy into it because they want to get the Russians off their soil. That is what I think the gentleman from Illinois does not recognize.

And they think it is a small price to pay. I am not happy with that arrangement.

But what I want to say to the gentleman is, do you know why the chairman of the full Committee on Armed Services is not on this floor speaking on behalf of your amendments? Because he views almost all of these amendments, and I do not want to include there the Bryant amendments on foreign nationals, which I would support, and even some aspects of the Schroeder amendment, but the reason why the chairman of the Armed Services Committee is not here is because this is political. He knows you are trying to load up a bill with a bunch of ideas to make people happy, so they can put out press releases, and that is why he is not there. I am not going to tell you that a serious effort being made to cut the funds to Korea is not for real. But I will tell you this, the chairman of the committee is going to oppose that amendment.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman is having lunch. But basically I chair the subcommittee panel on burden sharing, as does the gentleman from New York. I think that is why we are here. The full committee chairman is not here because this is political.

Mr. KASICH. I want to say to the gentlelady she knows as well as I do, and when you talk to the staff, even the staff of the majority party, this is a political exercise right now. And nobody is going to disagree that the issue of burden sharing is not real. I complimented the gentleman earlier in my remarks. But the tone of the debate has gotten to be where somehow it has been put aside.

□ 1400

The argument gets down to one where it is being made to look like Republicans do not want to force our allies to do anything. The Germans have paid their \$6.5 billion that we wanted on the war. The President beat them up. We beat up the Japanese. The Prime Minister made a trip to America.



All I am trying to say is, the problem is that there are few legitimate discussions that take place, but we have got a host of five separate amendments on burden sharing, a couple of months after the war, a couple of months after we had the most incredible collection of allies in the gulf with us. And I am just telling my colleagues, this is a political exercise. This is so my colleagues can put their press releases out.

These are senses of Congress. They do not even mean anything.

The bottom line is this Republican Party is for our allies contributing. We made it clear when it came to the gulf, the President of the Republican Party beat our allies up and made sure we got our money. So let us be honest with this debate when this vote occurs on the defense bill.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to that political animal, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I plead guilty to engaging in politics in the Chamber of the democratically elected House of Representatives.

I would say to the gentleman, he is very wrong when he says these are all sense-of-Congress resolutions. One is a sense-of-Congress resolution. The other four are binding.

This is not about the sense of Congress. This is about the dollars of the American people, the billions of dollars of the American people.

The gentleman said, do you want to make it look as if the Republicans are defending the allies for not doing more? No, the gentleman and others are free to say whatever they wish. I have scripted him no remarks. I have not put into the gentleman's mouth any words. These are serious efforts.

We are trying to reduce the budget, and the gentleman says it is just political.

Mr. Chairman, when people say something is just political, when they do not want to make the arguments on the merits, when people think they have got the unpopular side of an issue, they impugn the legitimacy of discussing it. We are saying that after 45 years of bearing a disproportionate share of costs of the common defense, America is entitled to more sharing. And, yes, we just saw it work in the gulf.

What we are saying is, let us take the principle that worked so successfully in the gulf and apply it in Japan, in Europe. We are saying that the Dutch and the Danes and the Belgians and the Norwegians and many others who have been the beneficiaries of America's determination and America's military strength and America's largesse for many, many years are capable of doing more, particularly since the threat against which we have been defending

them has, thanks to our efforts, substantially diminished.

This is very real. My amendment, which will come later, saves us \$8 billion, which we can put to deficit reduction this year and begin to draw down later. We are talking about the most central issue facing the American people today.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I am so glad the gentleman from Massachusetts made the point because the chairman of the Armed Services Committee opposes his effort to cut \$8 billion. The only amendments that the committee is going to accept are these senses of the Congress amendments. They are going to oppose the Mrazek amendment. The Mrazek amendment attempts to cut money from Korea.

Does the gentleman know what the position of the committee is? The position of the committee is no. Does the gentleman know what the position is on the Frank amendment designed to cut money? The position of the committee is no.

What is the position on the Schroeder amendment? The committee's position on the Schroeder amendment is yes. What is the impact of the Schroeder amendment? It is a sense of Congress.

The point is that this Armed Services Committee is not accepting any of the serious efforts by the gentleman's side to significantly reduce defense spending. The only thing that is being accepted is the sense of Congress resolution.

The point I am trying to make up here is, I did not come onto this floor and say anything until I heard a couple of people try to paint Republicans as against burden sharing. That is not true. It is our President that beat our allies up to collect the money. It is your committee and your chairman and the majority of your Democratic side and ours that are going to oppose the cuts in Korea. They are going to oppose the cuts in the Frank amendment. That is all I am trying to say.

I am just saying that most of this stuff is political. So let us not take it too darn seriously.

Do I agree with the concern of the gentleman from Massachusetts about what is going on with Germany, with Soviet troops? Of course. But to go down in the well and to try to use that to paint us as against burden sharing is just intellectually unfair.

I am as interested in burden sharing as other Members are. I have been after the foreign nationals also, and my Republicans have supported me. Let us stop the politics right now and let us start to act like the world did work together in resolving the problems in the desert.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the statesman, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has done it again. He wants to do everything for burden sharing except vote for it. He is going to speak in favor of it. And what is his crushing rejoinder? The chairman of the committee does not agree with me. I am offended the gentleman understated the degree of opposition. He did not just say no; he said, no, no, no. And I think he is wrong, and we are going to vote on it.

The gentleman appears to be under the misapprehension that the fact that the committee did not vote for this amendment somehow is an argument that is rational. It is an argument for what the committee wants to do. It does not go to the merits. We are serious about this.

The gentleman says, you are not serious because the committee was not for it. If the committee was for it, it would not be an amendment.

What we are doing is saying here is a chance to vote. Here is \$8 billion on the line. You either vote for it or not. What the gentleman wants to do is decry his passion for burden sharing and not vote for any of it.

Those of us who are serious will vote for burden-sharing amendments. Those who are not will denounce that as political.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond to the gentlewoman from Colorado who argued that we are opposing burden sharing. Nobody is arguing here against burden sharing. We are arguing that setting an arbitrary troop limit in Europe is just that. It is arbitrary and we ought to let those in charge establish the exact limits.

Her response was that it is just a sense-of-Congress resolution, and I am quoting, "that 100,000 ought to be more than adequate."

General Galvin probably knows more about this, with all due respect, and his decisions must be based upon more than a guess than 100,000 ought to be more than adequate.

What we are saying is, let General Galvin and his commanders in that NATO theater decide the exact level of troops that make sense in that theater. It is going to be very close to the number we are talking about anyway. He does not need a sense-of-Congress based upon no more than this is based upon to tell him what he ought to do. And that is why I think we ought to vote no on this amendment.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry. It is my understanding that this side has the right to close.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFNER). There seems to be no position of the committee on this amendment. Consequently, the proponent of the amendment has the right to close.

Mr. MARTIN. That would be this side of the aisle?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has the option to close the debate.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] has 3 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] has 5 minutes remaining.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me. I would hope that the Members of Congress would take this debate very seriously. The effort to discredit this debate on the basis that this is a sense of Congress resolution or that this is political is simply disingenuous. The fact is, we are talking real money and real commitments. Money that we go into debt for every year, money that causes homeowners and car buyers and credit card users to pay higher interest rates than they would have to, money that is used every year to subsidize the efforts of our allies in Europe, in the Far East.

We have got to understand that we have been paying a disproportionate share of the costs of the defense of the free world. Our allies have had a hell of a good year so far this year.

We have taken care of the refugees. We have answered their call for national disasters. We have fought a war in the Middle East. We have forgiven their debts. And in a number of days, we are going to give away American jobs in the free-trade bill.

What about Americans? What about people who are working every day in this country, who are trying to hold their families together, to educate their children, to make the mortgage payment and pay the utilities on their house?

□ 1410

This debate is about them. This debate is about the \$8 billion. This debate is about the excess troops in Europe. This debate is about the excess cost of defending Japan and defending Korea.

Mr. Chairman, this debate is about what that is costing Americans. It is costing them too much. The fact is that our allies can afford to pay more. The reason they do not pay more is we do not ask them for more.

The gentleman is quite correct in pointing out that when the President put the pressure on for the war in the Middle East, they coughed up, but they were not going to cough up before we asked. They were not going to cough up. They thought America would take

care of this problem, just as they think America is going to take care of the problem of the continued defense of Europe against, I do not know who now, but apparently still the Russians, who, as the gentleman from Illinois points out, the Germans are subsidizing to stay in Germany.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I say to Members, I hope you paid close attention to the debate here over the course of the last 35 minutes, because this is the sum total of the debate on the issue by the House of Representatives, the Committee on Armed Services, and the subcommittee on which I serve.

It has been interesting to me that over the course of the last 35 minutes, this figure that was pulled out of the air of 100,000 troops, we have found some very significant things that are going to happen if we can get to 100,000, rather than 150,000, 90,000, or whatever.

I have heard here on the floor of the House that we are going to be much healthier Americans, because we will have an adequate health care system; we are going to be better educated if we can only pass this amendment; we are going to be fully employed; I think we can take care of the deficit; and, now I understand if we can pass this amendment, the interest rates will come down. Somehow I doubt it.

Mr. Chairman, all I ask is that General Galvin and perhaps our people in NATO and our allies have the opportunity to read this, to try to understand where this group came up with 100,000 troops. Maybe we can go them one better.

As I said on the floor last year, if the President had said we were going to 50,000, I am sure an amendment would come up arguing that can we not go to 5,000?

Mr. Chairman, if we are going to be making these kinds of decisions, I would only hope that if we have time to think about it; we could do this in regular order and come through the committee system.

Mr. Chairman, how one decides well, 100,000 sounds good. At the same time maybe we should integrate the forces and have a European rapid reaction force. But somehow I think maybe 100,000 sounds OK, ought not to be the way our national policy and defense is made.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, we have had many people say why should we vote for this amendment? I think this amendment is a very important one. We have waited a long time since the Wall came down, and the troop numbers have not come down. We have had this debate many a time, and everybody says, not today, not now. It is a great idea, we are all burden sharers, but not today.

Mr. Chairman, I really think the important thing is to say we cannot wait too much longer. I have finally done my math and figured out that by cutting back, we are talking about \$3.25 billion.

Mr. Chairman, if megabucks and gigabucks tend to be too vague for Members, try \$3.25 billion. In Colorado that is a lot of money. It may not be in other places, but we do not sneeze at that kind of money.

Mr. Chairman, we looked at burden sharing during the whole Persian Gulf conflict, and we found that there was a great discrepancy between what was pledged and what was paid. We found that what it costs the American taxpayer today in extra costs would run the Denver public schools 3.3 years, would run the Denver government 2.5 years, and on and on and on. That is kind of an expensive cost. Where I come from, out West, that is kind of big money.

So we see people trying to minimize this. I do not think this is it at all. Yes, it has been studied up and down, by very, very serious people. We have had General Galvin in front of our committee talking about where the future was going. We have had General Lance talking about the Pacific, and where it was going, and what was happening. We meet with NATO parliamentarians visiting all the time where we talk.

What we are really saying is I would feel much better if this amendment were even much lower than 100,000. I think to think of 100,000 troops still in Europe by 1995 is really rather silly, when they have the capability and everything else to protect themselves. But, let us leave it there. That is what experts seem to say is necessary, and I think this is a sense-of-the-Congress resolution to say hurry it up. We are getting impatient. Our economy needs some jiggering, and this is one way we might start jiggering it a little faster.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to please vote for this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. HEFNER). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER].

The question was taken; the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 163, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 100]

AYES—260

Abercrombie	Anthony	Beilenson
Ackerman	Applegate	Bennett
Alexander	Aspin	Berman
Anderson	Atkins	Bilbray
Andrews (ME)	AuCoin	Boehlt
Annuzio	Bacchus	Bonior



Borski	Hertel	Peterson (FL)	Dooley	Lent	Ros-Lehtinen
Boucher	Hoagland	Peterson (MN)	Doolittle	Lewis (CA)	Saxton
Boxer	Hochbrueckner	Pickle	Dorman (CA)	Lewis (FL)	Schaefer
Brooks	Holloway	Porter	Dreier	Livingston	Schiff
Browder	Horn	Poshard	Duncan	Lloyd	Schulze
Brown	Horton	Price	Edwards (OK)	Lowery (CA)	Shaw
Bruce	Hoyer	Pursell	Fascell	Marchley	Shuster
Bryant	Huckaby	Quillen	Fawell	Marlenee	Sisisky
Bustamante	Jacobs	Rahall	Fields	Martin	Skeen
Callahan	Jefferson	Rangel	Fish	McCandless	Skelton
Campbell (CO)	Jenkins	Ravenel	Franks (CT)	McCollum	Slattery
Cardin	Johnson (CT)	Reed	Galleghy	McCrery	Slaughter (VA)
Carper	Johnson (SD)	Regula	Gallo	McCurdy	Smith (NJ)
Carr	Johnston	Richardson	Gekas	McDade	Smith (OR)
Chandler	Jones (GA)	Ritter	Geren	McEwen	Smith (TX)
Chapman	Jones (NC)	Roe	Gibbons	McGrath	Snowe
Clay	Jontz	Roemer	Gillmor	McMillan (NC)	Solomon
Clement	Kanjorski	Rohrabacher	Gilman	Meyers	Spence
Coleman (TX)	Kapoor	Rose	Gingrich	Michel	Stearns
Collins (IL)	Kennedy	Rostenkowski	Goodling	Molinari	Stenholm
Collins (MI)	Kennelly	Roth	Goss	Mollohan	Stump
Condit	Kildee	Rowland	Hammerschmidt	Montgomery	Sundquist
Conyers	Kleczka	Roybal	Hancock	Moorhead	Tanner
Costello	Kolter	Russo	Hansen	Murtha	Taylor (MS)
Cox (IL)	Kopetski	Sabo	Hastert	Myers	Taylor (NC)
Coyne	Kostmayer	Sanders	Herger	Neal (NC)	Thomas (CA)
Cramer	LaFalce	Sangmeister	Hobson	Nichols	Thomas (GA)
Crane	Lantos	Santor	Houghton	Olin	Thomas (WY)
Dannemeyer	LaRocco	Sarpalius	Hubbard	Ortiz	Torricelli
Darden	Leach	Savage	Hughes	Oxley	Valentine
de la Garza	Lehman (CA)	Sawyer	Hunter	Packard	Vander Jagt
DeFazio	Levin (MI)	Scheuer	Hutto	Pallone	Vucanovich
DeLauro	Levine (CA)	Schroeder	Hyde	Parker	Walker
Dellums	Lewis (GA)	Schumer	Inhofe	Paxon	Walsh
Derrick	Lightfoot	Sensenbrenner	Ireland	Petri	Weber
Dingell	Lipinski	Serrano	James	Pickett	Weldon
Dixon	Long	Sharp	Kasich	Ramstad	Wilson
Donnelly	Lowey (NY)	Shays	Klug	Ray	Wylie
Dorgan (ND)	Luken	Sikorski	Kolbe	Rhodes	Young (AK)
Downey	Manton	Skaggs	Kyl	Ridge	Young (FL)
Durbin	Markey	Slaughter (NY)	Lagomarsino	Riggs	Zeliff
Dwyer	Martinez	Smith (FL)	Lancaster	Rinaldo	
Dymally	Matsui	Smith (IA)	Laughlin	Roberts	
Early	Mavroules	Solarz			
Eckart	Mazzoli	Spratt			
Edwards (CA)	McCloskey	Staggers	Foglietta	Hopkins	Rogers
Edwards (TX)	McDermott	Stallings	Gradison	Lehman (FL)	
Emerson	McHugh	Stark	Gray	Murphy	
Engel	McMillen (MD)	Stokes			
English	McNulty	Studds			
Erdreich	Mfume	Sweet			
Espy	Miller (CA)	Swift			
Evans	Miller (OH)	Synar			
Fazio	Miller (WA)	Tallon			
Feighan	Mineta	Tauzin			
Fink	Mink	Thornton			
Ford (MI)	Moakley	Torres			
Ford (TN)	Moody	Towns			
Frank (MA)	Moran	Traficant			
Frost	Morella	Traxler			
Gaydos	Morrison	Unsold			
Gejdenson	Mrazek	Upton			
Gephardt	Nagle	Vento			
Gilchrest	Natcher	Visclosky			
Glickman	Neal (MA)	Volkmer			
Gonzalez	Nowak	Washington			
Gordon	Nussle	Waters			
Grandy	Oaker	Waxman			
Green	Oberstar	Weiss			
Guarini	Obey	Wheat			
Gunderson	Orton	Whitten			
Hall (OH)	Owens (NY)	Williams			
Hall (TX)	Owens (UT)	Wise			
Hamilton	Panetta	Wolf			
Harris	Patterson	Wolpe			
Hatcher	Payne (NJ)	Wyden			
Hayes (IL)	Payne (VA)	Yates			
Hayes (LA)	Pease	Yatron			
Hefley	Pelosi	Zimmer			
Hefner	Penny				
Henry	Perkins				

## NOT VOTING—7

□ 1436

Messrs. DICKINSON, SPENCE, and SLATTERY changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. HEFNER and Mr. CHANDLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## ANNOUNCING THE ASSASSINATION OF RAJIV GANDHI

(By unanimous consent Mr. SOLARZ was allowed to speak out of order.)

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I regret to report to the House that Rajiv Gandhi, the former Prime Minister of India, was just assassinated in a bomb explosion that went off as he was emerging from his car at a campaign rally about 25 miles south of Madras.

We do not know at the present time how many other people were killed or who was behind this dastardly deed.

But I did want to say, as someone who has gotten to know Mr. Gandhi well over the years and who considered him a personal friend, that this is a truly tragic development.

□ 1440

Rajiv Gandhi was a man who could have led a life of leisure, but he chose, instead, in spite of considerable personal risk, to devote himself to the welfare and well-being of his people.

This bomb explosion was aimed at the heart of Indian democracy. It may

have succeeded in killing a young political leader, the former Prime Minister of the country, but I know full well that it will not succeed in destroying political pluralism in the world's most populous democracy.

In light of what happened after the tragic assassination of his mother, when communal rioting led to considerable blood-letting, I very much hope that the Government of India, even in its moment of bereavement, will take whatever steps need to be taken in order to prevent any repetition of this kind of violence, which would only perpetuate and reinforce this tragic cycle of killing and more killing.

Let me just say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I think many Members knew Rajiv Gandhi. I believe he was a friend of the United States. We did not always agree with his policies, but I am absolutely convinced that he shared our values. As elected representatives of the world's most powerful democracy, I think all Members feel a very special sense of grief when the political leader of one of the most prominent political parties in the world's most populous democracy is killed, in the very act of campaigning, on election day, at a moment when the people of India were in the process of attempting to determine their own destiny—through the ballot, and not by the bullet.

I hope that democracy survives in India. I am sure it will. However, this is a moment of special sadness for all who knew Rajiv Gandhi personally, and all who were committed to the preservation of political pluralism in that great country.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLARZ. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Chairman, I just want to ask, if it is possible, if we might have a moment of silence on behalf of all Members, for Rajiv Gandhi's family, and for the principles of democracy, which have been so sadly shattered this afternoon.

I ask for a moment of silence, if that is possible.

(Moment of silence observed.)

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). The Chair appreciates the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] bringing this news to the Committee's attention.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 7, printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

For what purpose does the gentleman from Massachusetts rise?

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FRANK OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts: At the end of title X (page 180, after line 8), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1033. REDUCTION OF DEFENSE EXPENDITURES IN ALLIED COUNTRIES.**

(a) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—In recognition of the fact that reductions in the number of United States military personnel over the next several years will decrease the need for United States military installations in foreign countries, it is the sense of Congress that the Secretary of Defense should aggressively pursue—

(1) the closure of United States military installations outside the United States;

(2) agreements with the governments of those countries in which the remaining military installations are located to increase the amount of host-country support provided by those countries; and

(3) the withdrawal of United States forces assigned to or stationed in Europe, Japan, or Korea.

(b) **REDUCTIONS REQUIRED.**—The total amount authorized to be appropriated by this Act for each of the fiscal years 1992 and 1993 is the sum of the separate authorizations contained in this Act for that fiscal year reduced by \$8,000,000,000. Program changes required in order to comply with the funding reduction required by this subsection (to the extent such reduction is not offset by increased levels of host-nation support) shall be made only by the withdrawal of United States forces or equipment assigned to or stationed in Europe, Japan, or Korea.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than January 1 of each year, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report to Congress describing the steps being taken by the Department of Defense to terminate military operations of the United States at military installations outside the United States. The report shall be submitted in both a classified and unclassified form and shall identify the following:

(1) The criteria adopted by the Secretary to select foreign military installations for closure or realignment and any deviation from the criteria.

(2) All activities undertaken, or proposed to be undertaken, to close or realign foreign military installations selected for closure or realignment.

(3) The fair market value of the improvements at these installations determined as provided in section 2921(b) of the Defense Base Closure and Realignment Act of 1990 (10 U.S.C. 2687 note; 104 Stat. 1820).

(4) The status of negotiations with host countries regarding the closure or realignment of these installations.

(5) The steps being taken by the Secretary to ensure that the United States receives consideration equal to the fair market value of the improvements at these installations from the host countries.

(6) The efforts being made by the Secretary to aggressively seek increases in host-country support for military installations that are not selected to be closed.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, it was just announced by agreement that I will yield 10 minutes of my 20 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY], who is in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN] will be recognized for 10 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to mention that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is one of the leaders in this effort.

The House made a very good start, Mr. Chairman, in adopting the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], whose long service on the House Committee on Armed Services, and study of this issue, has made the gentlewoman justifiably one of our leaders.

This amendment, and the amendment to follow, are further steps in that package. We are dealing here, Mr. Chairman, with the most important set of public policy issues that faces this country. We are talking about recognizing our success in a way that allows the United States to deal with some of the areas where we have succeeded. In 1945, the United States undertook an extraordinary mission in the world. We went to the aid not just of our former allies in World War II, but we went to the aid of our former enemies, Germany and Japan. There is not, in my judgment, a greater example of generosity and decency in world history than the response of the American people to the devastation of World War II and to the threat to freedom posed by the Communist bloc under Josef Stalin.

For decades, literally decades, the American people spent generously in both foreign economic assistance and in military support, providing bulwarks behind which the nations that are today our NATO allies in Western Germany and nations in East Asia could not resist aggression but prosper.

It is to the credit of those nations, Japan, Germany, and the nations of Western Europe, that they are today, prosperous and democratic. Indeed, Germany and Japan are more democratic than ever in their history.

Obviously, the inhabitants of those nations deserve the prime credit, but we get some secondary credit. For decades, the American people have prepared to spend disproportionately on the free world's burden. Where are we today? We face today a Communist bloc which is no longer a bloc, because the Communist bloc consists of, I would have said a year ago, of the Soviet Union. Now, they are lucky if it is all of the Soviet Union. Every time the Soviet Union moves, another piece drops off. Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and East Germany are no longer military allies of the Soviet Union. The People's Republic of China, once a great military threat, is

now a nation so reasonable in the eyes of our President, that his major goal is to continue to give them most favored nation treatment so they can sell the United States things cheap.

Therefore we have, thanks in part to our determination, a substantial diminution in the military threat that we face. We have, on the other hand, an increased strength. The European Community, our NATO allies, are collectively, today, richer, larger in population, possessed of a better industrial base, than their potential adversary, the Soviet Union. Japan, today, when it looks at the People's Republic of China, looks at a potential billion customers, not invaders. Even in South Korea, we have a government that is larger, with a larger population, and better industrial base than its now isolated opponent, North Korea.

This is not an amendment that calls for the dismantling of America's overseas military expenditure. Understand, if we cut it in half, if we cut in half the American overseas military presence on a continuing basis, leaving aside temporary intervention in the gulf, but if we cut in half what we have permanently stationed overseas, we would still be, by far, the largest overseas military power in the history of the world, except for our own previous record. When we are dealing with nations that are in trouble and in need of our assistance, that is legitimate. However, subsidizing the Netherlands is very stupid. That does not make the Dutch bad people. The Dutch do not subsidize the United States, and we are not bad people.

What we are saying is, there comes a point in the relations between and among nations, when equality ought to be the rule, not subsidy. This amendment says that the tens and tens of billions we spend overseas, beginning on October 1991, the President has to reduce by \$8 billion the amount that Americans have to borrow to subsidize our wealthy allies. He can do it as Commander in Chief by reducing troops. If he carries out the Schroeder amendment, he will save almost half of what we ask him to save if he simply follows that. If he carries out the Bonior amendment of a year ago and makes the Japanese pay what they should be paying for the troops they get, that alone would make more than half. He can close bases overseas instead of in America or in addition to it. He can get other countries to contribute.

We are celebrating the success of Desert Storm. We get tens of billions of dollars. This asks for less, by far, than we got in Desert Storm. Are people going to tell the United States that the defense of Kuwait was more important than the defense of all of Europe? Is it fair they should contribute? It was to the defense of Kuwait, but continue to get a free ride everywhere else? This is



not bashing allies, unless bash is redefined to mean do not give money away too unnecessarily. This is not fortress America. This is an effort to adjust the balance.

On the other hand, we have got unmet needs in this country. We have a deficit in this country which we exacerbate as we subsidize our allies.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to an author of this amendment, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

□ 1450

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. He states it better than most of us can.

This is not bashing anyone. This is not isolationist. The issue nearly 45 years after the end of the Second World War is will others who were war-tattered and required our help, but who are now strong and shrewd and tough and international competitors begin owning up to their responsibilities? Will they pay for their fair share of the defense umbrella?

I do not blame anybody for not being willing to pay for an umbrella as long as somebody is willing to hold it and says, "Come on, step under here. We will take care of it."

But the fact is this country cannot continue to afford to take care of everyone anymore. We are choking on debt, spending money we do not have for things we do not need.

In this instance, if you take a look at what Germany, Japan, Italy, the Netherlands, dozens of other countries pay for defense, it does not nearly match our contribution.

What the gentleman from Massachusetts is saying, what I and others are saying, is that it is time to even out the burden. How can we compete around the world if we are spending all this money on defense, relieving others of that obligation and they instead spend all their money in the international marketplace in competition. We lose.

We are just saying that we love our allies. We think they are wonderful. We want to remain allies. We just want a full partnership. We want a new world order in which they pay their fair share and if we get to that point, it will relieve the American taxpayers of tens of billions of dollars that we now extract from their pockets in order to contribute overseas for someone else's responsibility.

I think it is time now for us to stand up in the interests of this country to say that we cannot keep doing this. We have to change the way we do business, and that is not unfair to our allies. It is just plainly insisting that the Second World War is over. They are in a different position, in a better position now to be able to help and now we ask them for that help.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Frank amendment.

The language of this amendment gets off to a good start in that it expresses a sense of Congress recognizing the fact that we will reduce the number of U.S. military personnel over the next several years. From that point on, unfortunately, the amendment ignores a great deal more of the facts than it recognizes.

First, it ignores the most fundamental fact concerning our military forces overseas—they are deployed forward primarily to provide for American national security and to protect American national interests. Our men and women in uniform are not mercenaries for hire. They are not modern Hessians we dispatch to defend the highest bidder. We are extremely and rightly proud of them and the way they have secured American interests overseas. They have been instrumental in winning the cold war as well as the war to reverse Iraqi aggression.

The Frank amendment also ignores the fact that we are already adjusting to the new realities created by these victories.

With the end of the cold war, we are reducing our force structure by 25 percent over 5 years. In spite of the obvious spike created by Desert Storm, the plan is to be back on the projected track in these reductions next year.

In Europe, we are drawing down to about a third of the troop strength we have maintained for the past few years.

We are withdrawing more than 15,000 troops from our deployments in the Pacific in the first phase of reductions here.

The Frank amendment further ignores the fact that the Armed Services Committee has been working hard to adjust the defense budget and projected overseas deployments to the new realities. The committee bill we have before us is the product of that conscientious effort.

The amendment also ignores the fact that the budget resolution within which this Defense authorization bill was crafted also represented a painstaking effort to adjust defense spending to new security and fiscal realities.

Finally, this amendment seems to ignore the fact that the Armed Services Committee and, indeed the entire Congress has been pressing for increased sharing of the burdens and responsibilities of defense on the part of our allies. Our pressures have clearly had some effect. Contributions to the common defense have grown, especially in the case of Japan and Korea. Allies cash and in-kind contributions to U.S. operations in Desert Shield and Desert

Storm are climbing to nearly \$40 billion.

In sum, the committee bill we have before us represents the best efforts of the Armed Services Committee to insure that our defense budget, force structure, and forward deployments are adjusted to new realities, given some remaining uncertainty and instability, while taking care of our men and women in uniform at home and overseas. It also reflects the requirement to make that adjustment within the budget resolution and the constant attempt to maximize allied contributions to our common defense.

Attempting to cut \$8 billion across the board from this bill is not a responsible course of action.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I think lost sight of in this discussion is the fact that our troops are overseas, not as a favor to anybody in the world, but they are there to protect our interests as well as those of our allies.

We have troops in Japan because we would just as soon Japan not join the nuclear club. We have troops in Korea to protect South Korea from North Korea and to protect Japan. Korea has been defined as a dagger pointed at the heart of Japan, but our troops are there to protect our national interests as well.

If we are to turn ourselves into military dependents of our allies by passing the hat and becoming mercenaries, I think we weaken our position as the leader of the free world.

Now, Japan pays 70 percent of all of the costs of maintaining our troops in their country. The only thing they do not pay is the personnel and normal operating costs of our troops there that are ongoing wherever they are. By 1995, it will be cheaper to station our troops in Japan than to station them in the United States.

Would the Philippines pay like Japan does for having our troops present.

Now, Korea, there has been a fourfold increase in what Korea has been paying for our troops there since 1988; not enough, but progress is being made and it is continually being made. They now pay about \$150 million a year for our troops over there.

NATO pays 70 percent, as does Japan, of all the basing costs for our troops in Europe.

It is to our advantage to have the front in Europe and not in Boston, New York, or Newport News.

So it is to our advantage, it is in our national interest to have our troops stationed where they are.

Burden sharing is important. Uncle Sam should never be Uncle Sucker, but the facts are that Japan is paying its share, 70 percent. NATO is paying its share, 70 percent, and with the reductions in the size of our military that

are planned in the future, there will be increasing savings.

So I lament and regret the meat ax \$8 billion cut that the very thoughtful gentleman from Massachusetts seeks to impose here. In this instance, his thoughtfulness has lapsed somewhat.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HYDE. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank my disarming friend, the gentleman from Illinois, for yielding to me.

He referred somewhat slightly to America passing the hat and becoming militarily dependent, saying this would impugn our leadership; but yet that is what we did in Operation Desert Storm.

Does the gentleman think that we were passing the hat and therefore lost our leadership because we got them to pay in Desert Storm?

Mr. HYDE. I think that was an emergency situation. The gentleman contemplates a permanent state of affairs where the paychecks will come from some of our allies. That puts us in a position of dependency.

There is an old saying, "Who eats my bread sings my song."

I would rather we be the principal support for our own troops and accept from these countries the extra costs that are superimposed by us being there in Japan, in Korea, and in NATO. They are still our Armed Forces after all.

So I think the gentleman's amendment at this time is ill-advised, although the spirit in which it is offered certainly is well intentioned.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend. He is always about a year behind me, but progress is coming.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I am happy to be a year behind the gentleman, maybe two, if possible.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. NEAL].

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise to lend my voice to the thousands across the country that are questioning our spending overseas to insure the security of our allies. No one questions that the United States has important interests in Germany, Western Europe, Japan, and South Korea. What we are questioning is the huge defense burden that we continue to bear to defend these countries in this era of reduced international tensions.

In the past 45 years, we have seen Japan and Germany develop from destroyed nations to economic superpowers that today are the major players in the world economy. Can Japan and Germany, as well as South Korea,

afford to pay for a share of their defense? Of course they can. Should we insist on a financial commitment from them for their defense? Of course we should. America has waited nearly five decades for this moment, when these defeated enemies—now our strong allies—could stand on their own. I see great irony here—the world has changed drastically over the past 2 years and yet our defense and foreign policy thinking remains stuck in the cold war of the 1960's. It is time to look at the world as it is today.

We continue to spend a massive portion of our gross national product on our defense and the defense of these nations. Those funds are desperately needed here at home. Japan, Germany, and South Korea, free from the burden of providing for their own security, are able to spend billions on research and development on scientific and technology areas. Those advances then lead to products that are in direct competition with American-made goods. While citizens in these nations continue to see advances in their quality of life, we continue to see our schools, hospitals, and roads deteriorate for lack of funds. This is not fair.

I believe this amendment is a fair and reasoned approach to bringing us to the goal of defense burden sharing. The host nation can assume military costs as American forces are withdrawn. There is no question that these countries can afford to shoulder this burden. Many people in these countries also believe that the time has come for them to begin to provide for self-defense. This amendment will hasten the process.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would save America some \$8 billion. We all could talk for a great deal of time about how to spend that \$8 billion. That is what this defense debate could lead to—a debate on our pressing domestic needs. I hope we can pass this amendment and get to that domestic debate. I urge all of my colleagues to support the Frank-Durbin-Gejdenson, and Bryant amendment.

□ 1500

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts is opposed by the Committee on Armed Services. The committee feels that over the course of the last 3 or 4 years, at least from their point of view, we have applied substantial pressure out there to reduce U.S. troop strength around the world. Indeed, that is something we are doing in unison with the administration.

Just to say, "Well, why not, we will just whack out \$8 billion, why not?", that is the kind of approach that kind of flies in the face of what the Committee on Armed Services tries to do from time to time, and that is to have hear-

ings and make decisions based on information that is provided to us; or at least that should be our procedure.

But here we are again, just one more meat ax approach.

I, for one person, certainly do not see any \$8 billion in savings coming out of this unless it comes out of the hides of the troops and their ability to train.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. PICKETT].

Mr. PICKETT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment because as a practical matter the amendment is not going to achieve the results that it purports to achieve. These troops that are stationed overseas are there with their weapons, their housing, and all the other support services that are required to sustain them. And if they are going to be brought back to this country, there is going to be an increase in costs for the Department of Defense as opposed to there being a decrease.

So, rather than saving money, this could very well cost this Nation additional money. It is a fact that when we bring troops back, their families have to be housed, the troops have to be housed, and we are closing bases here in the United States. We simply do not have the facilities available at this time to accommodate them.

So, you say, "We will bring them back and put them out of the service, we will just shut the operation down." Well, that will not work either, because we know that the force levels for our Armed Forces through the mid-1990's have been established. They are indeed going to come down from some 2.1 million to approximately 1.6 million, and provision has been made for that. But there is no provision to bring back these additional troops from overseas, and there is no savings to be realized.

I would ask my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds to point out that within a very short period of time, thanks to pressure from the Congress, we got about \$38 billion already in hand from our allies; \$8 billion is a very small amount to get from Denmark, Germany, Japan, and all those European countries which have it. So, one way to get the money if the administration is serious is to ask. The notion that we somehow cannot get more money, that is what they told us before Desert Storm; it was wrong then and it is wrong now.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT], a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I think it is very clear that the zeal of the Committee on Armed Services and the



administration for burden sharing is not the same level as the zeal which is shared by, I think, a majority of the Members of this House or by the public.

The fact of the matter is that we have heard speeches today defending the status quo which are exactly the same speeches which have been heard every single year for, I think it is fair to say, at least the last 5 years in this House, telling us that we should not be pushing forward on burden sharing or burden shedding, depending on how you look at it.

The fact simply is this: Some 45 years after World War II, we Americans are still spending upwards of \$200 billion a year paying the cost of defending other countries on the other sides of two oceans, countries which are doing better economically, have more resources than we do economically, and yet do not come forward with their fair share of the policy of paying for their own defense.

What do they do with the money that they save? They do a better job of educating their children, a better job of caring for their old people, a better job of protecting their environment and, much worse, a better job of competing with us in international trade. It is an expense we can no longer afford.

It does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that this sum of money is not far from the amount of money which we run as a budget deficit every year. This is money we are borrowing. And when the opponents of the status quo stand up and say \$8 billion is a lot of money, you bet it is a lot of money. It is money that we are going to have to borrow next year, unless we begin to tell our allies that it is time for them to begin to pay their fair share of their own defense. Read the figures: Every year during the 1980's the American taxpayers paid \$160 billion to \$170 billion, and that is every year of the 1980's, to defend our allies in Europe and \$30 billion to \$40 billion to defend countries in Asia. We do not have the money. We are borrowing that money. Those of us who are standing on the floor today in support of a real effort in the area of burden sharing are simply saying let us stop borrowing all this money and giving it away to our allies. Let us tell them this year it is time for them to pay a fair share of their own defense.

Let me read to you another figure: At the present time, the European members of NATO have a collective gross national product greater than that of the United States and at least two times greater than that of the Soviet Union. Yet, America spends more on NATO defenses than all of the other 15 alliance members combined.

How much evidence do we need of the peril in which we find ourselves today economically and with regard to our own budgets than this? Surely common

sense dictates that it is time for us to stop listening to the tired explanations of the defenders of the status quo on both sides of the aisle in the Committee on Armed Services and in this administration, who will refuse to stand up and say it is time for us to begin to recognize the need for fiscal sanity, for common sense, and to recognize our allies are not going to voluntarily begin to start paying their fair share? We have to tell them it is going to be required of them.

If this \$8 billion expenditure is so important to their defense, they simply need to offer up the money. We do not have to pull the troops out, we do not have to make any changes, if they will simply pay the balance of the \$8 billion that is in the amendment today. But if they are not going to pay it, then surely it is not worthwhile that we pay it. Let us save that much money.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRYANT. I yield to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to say for the benefit of the people here what a strong supporter the gentleman has been of burden sharing, for a long time. I remember, when the gentleman and I were on the Budget Committee at the same time, the strong case he made at that time that we could not take care of our own people because the money is going to other countries and they ought to be reimbursing us for that defense. It is common sense. Its time has come. I just wanted to point out to the Chamber that the gentleman in the well has been fighting this fight for a long time, and I hope his day has come.

□ 1510

Mr. BRYANT. I thank the gentlewoman from California for those observations. One of my staunchest allies in these arguments was the gentlewoman from California, and I appreciate her willingness to stand up today with me and continue to urge a realistic change in this policy.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS].

Mr. DICKS. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to point out to my colleagues that while there is a perception that the defense budget is growing, I want to make it clear that since fiscal year 1985, the defense budget has been coming down, and that between fiscal year 1985 and fiscal year 1996, we will have reduced defense spending by 34 percent in real terms. Now, in my judgment, we need a strong NATO presence at a reduced level. It is already part of the administration's plan to come down from two corps down to one corps or two divisions in Europe. And I think we can survive with that quite nicely.

Today we have taken a position, with the adoption of the Schroeder amendment, which indicates that the Congress thinks about 100,000 in Europe is fine. Let the administration work toward that goal.

What I do not like about this amendment is that after we have reached an agreement with the administration about what defense spending is going to be, that in both 1992 and 1993 we would across the board cut another \$8 billion out of the defense of our country.

We have just been through Operation Desert Storm and Desert Shield, where we used effectively American military technology. We had the aid and assistance of a coalition. We worked with that coalition effectively. We should not be in the business of unilaterally here on the floor of the House of Representatives changing America's foreign policy. And I think that is exactly what this amendment attempts to do.

I am all for Congress giving direction and oversight to the administration, but a meat ax \$8 billion approach in 1992 and 1993 I do not think gets the job done.

If we are going to change our relationship with our NATO allies, we need to do it. We should work on a bilateral basis or through NATO to change the working relationship. We should not do it here on the House floor.

We have sent a message with the resolution. Let us get serious again and realize that we are going to do great damage to the credibility of our military and great damage to the funding over the next several years of many very important programs if we follow the lead here and cut \$8 billion more out of defense in 1992 and \$8 billion more in 1993.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Washington was both right and wrong. He was right, we have to make some changes, but we have to make them here on the floor because otherwise they will not get made. Second, this does not cut money from defense. It can just as well be made up by burden-sharing contributions from those countries in which we have the defense installations. So this is not a meat ax approach to cut defense spending. That is clear.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield two and a half minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Each year in the United States we spend more than \$170 billion protecting our allies who can well afford to defend themselves. We pay \$20 billion annually

to protect the sealanes around Japan, at a time when our own citizens are afraid to leave their homes or are unable to obtain and pay for basic health care, are in danger of losing their jobs to foreign competition. It is madness for us to continue subsidizing our wealthy allies who are our fiercest economic competitors.

In our effort to protect our allies against rapidly evaporating threats, we are waging war on our own citizens.

The amendment we are now considering is a modest first step toward the goal of sharing the burden of world security. It gives the administration a great deal of flexibility on how to reach the \$8 billion in savings that it mandates.

In whatever combination the Defense Department and the State Department deem most advantageous, they can close overseas bases, withdraw forces or equipment from Europe, from Japan, from South Korea, or negotiate increased financial support from the host nations.

Many of us are asking why we should continue to maintain a force of over 40,000 troops in Korea 45 years after the war, and why should we be bearing the burden of this U.N. action alone. Why are we still spending billions of dollars protecting West Germany from East Germany, more than a year after the Berlin Wall was torn down?

Because of the strictures in last year's budget resolution, the savings that will be realized from this amendment cannot be shifted to meet non-defense needs. However, this \$8 billion in savings can make our Nation's economy stronger by being applied to additional deficit reduction. Given our skyrocketing national debt and its attendant annual interest payments of \$200 billion a year, which is almost what we spend for NATO and Japan combined, and is almost equal to what we spend for every domestic program in this country from coast to coast, whatever it is the Federal money is attached to, it is crucial to our economic security and continuing international competitiveness that we take every opportunity to lessen the yoke of debt we are imposing on future Americans. And while we are working to level the playing field on the economic battleground, it is essential that our Nation is not weakened by diverting its resources for the defense of competitors who are indisputably able to pay their own way.

If the administration required burden sharing in the Persian Gulf, why not apply that policy in Europe and Japan and Korea as well? And I urge the passage of this amendment, and I only regret that my name is not on it.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr.

DURBIN], who is one of the cosponsors in spirit certainly with the gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER].

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized for 1 minute and 45 seconds.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. We are asking for an \$8 billion reduction. If you follow the proceedings in the House of Representatives, you have heard over the past several years 1-percent cuts and 2-percent cuts on many domestic programs, some amounting to \$1 billion or \$2 billion. But we are dealing with \$8 billion. Is it a significant cut? Yes. Is it a meat ax? No. We are talking about \$8 billion in reductions out of the amount of money we are spending to defend Europe, about \$180 billion a year; the amount we are spending to defend Korea, \$3 billion a year; and the amount we are spending to defend Japan, \$9 billion a year. It is a significant cut but it is an important and timely cut as well.

This \$8 billion saved could be money spent for the national security of the United States of America, for helping middle-income and working families to meet their daily obligations, perhaps to give working families an opportunity to send their children to college without having them overburdened with debt.

We spend \$9 billion each year to defend Japan; \$9 billion that Americans send to Japan which then exports to the United States 30 percent of all the automobiles that we drive, 90 percent of the motorcycles, 90 percent of the electronic equipment. A country which has bought Rockefeller Plaza and movie companies, a country which has become a dominant force in our economy. And we still subsidize their national defense.

It has to come to an end. Let us not get stuck in the time warp of World War II. Let us have a policy that makes sense for 1991, and that is what the Frank amendment does.

□ 1520

It says we either cut the \$8 billion in overseas military spending, or have our allies pay their fair share. It is a simple, straightforward amendment, and this vote is a good barometer as to whether or not we are sensitive to America's needs in the world today.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, briefly, to point out again to those Members who have not been listening intently to this debate, which I know all Members of the House probably have been, it is a fact that the stand of the House Committee on Armed Services is against this particular amendment. We did not stand in opposition to the last amendment. There are others that are

coming up that we do not oppose, and I think it is very important to recognize that we have considered all these matters very, very carefully.

Mr. Chairman, in looking across the world, American bases do not sit in Japan or on the 38th parallel totally in defense of Korea or Japan, or in Germany for protecting the Western Europeans. It is also to protect the vital interests of the United States of America.

As one of the Secretaries of Defense a number of years ago when I first got here stated, does anyone really think if the Japanese rearmed tomorrow morning, that American presence in the Pacific would be less impressive? They are mistaken, because the fact is America would be in the Pacific with a rearmed Japan probably stronger than we are today. We would certainly be overseas in Europe, whether or not Germany rearmed fully or not.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is very important that we work this problem of burden sharing out, that we work it out through the administration, and through the Department of Defense. Again, the House Committee on Armed Services urges all Members to vote no on the Frank amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BRUCE). All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 167, noes 255, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]

AYES—167

Abercrombie	Dellums	Hochbrueckner
Ackerman	Derrick	Horn
Alexander	Dingell	Hughes
Anderson	Dixon	Jacobs
Andrews (ME)	Donnelly	Jefferson
Anthony	Dooley	Johnson (SD)
Applegate	Dorgan (ND)	Johnston
Atkins	Downey	Jontz
AuCoin	Duncan	Kanjorski
Beilenson	Durbin	Kaptur
Bennett	Dwyer	Kennedy
Berman	Dymally	Kennelly
Bonior	Early	Kildee
Borski	Eckart	Klecza
Boucher	Edwards (CA)	Kolter
Boxer	Engel	Kopetski
Brown	Evans	Kostmayer
Bruce	Feighan	LaFalce
Bryant	Flake	Lantos
Bustamante	Ford (MI)	Leach
Campbell (CO)	Ford (TN)	Lehman (CA)
Cardin	Frank (MA)	Levin (MI)
Carr	Gaydos	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gejdenson	Lipinski
Collins (IL)	Gephardt	Long
Collins (MI)	Gordon	Lowe (NY)
Conyers	Grandy	Markley
Cox (IL)	Green	Matsui
Coyne	Hall (OH)	McCloskey
de la Garza	Hayes (IL)	McDermott
DeFazio	Hayes (LA)	McNulty
DeLauro	Hertel	Mfume



Miller (CA) Rangel  
Miller (OH) Reed  
Mineta Roe  
Mink Rohrabacher  
Moakley Roth  
Moody Roybal  
Moran Russo  
Mrazek Sanders  
Nagle Sangmeister  
Neal (MA) Sarpalius  
Nowak Savage  
Nussle Sawyer  
Oakar Scheuer  
Oberstar Schroeder  
Obey Schumer  
Orton Serrano  
Owens (NY) Sharp  
Owens (UT) Shays  
Panetta Sikorski  
Payne (NJ) Skaggs  
Pelosi Slaughter (NY)  
Perkins Smith (FL)  
Poshard Staggers  
Rahall Stark

## NOES—255

Allard Frost  
Andrews (NJ) Gallegly  
Andrews (TX) Gallo  
Annunzio Gekas  
Archer Geren  
Armey Gibbons  
Aspin Gilchrest  
Bacchus Gillmor  
Baker Gilman  
Ballenger Gingrich  
Barnard Glickman  
Barton Gonzalez  
Bateman Goodling  
Bentley Goss  
Bereuter Guarini  
Bevill Gunderson  
Bilbray Hall (TX)  
Bilirakis Hamilton  
Billy Hammerschmidt  
Boehlert Hancock  
Boehner Hansen  
Brewster Harris  
Brooks Hastert  
Broomfield Hatcher  
Browder Hefley  
Bunning Hefner  
Burton Henry  
Byron Herger  
Callahan Hoagland  
Camp Hobson  
Campbell (CA) Holloway  
Carper Horton  
Chandler Houghton  
Chapman Hoyer  
Clement Hubbard  
Clinger Huckabee  
Coble Hunter  
Coleman (MO) Hutto  
Coleman (TX) Hyde  
Combest Inhofe  
Condit Ireland  
Cooper James  
Costello Jenkins  
Coughlin Johnson (CT)  
Cox (CA) Jones (GA)  
Cramer Jones (NC)  
Crane Kasich  
Cunningham Klug  
Dannemeyer Kolbe  
Darden Kyl  
Davis Lagomarsino  
DeLay Lancaster  
Dickinson LaRocco  
Dicks Laughlin  
Doollittle Lent  
Dornan (CA) Levine (CA)  
Dreier Lewis (CA)  
Edwards (OK) Lewis (FL)  
Edwards (TX) Lightfoot  
Emerson Livingston  
English Lloyd  
Erdreich Lowery (CA)  
Espy Luken  
Fasell Machtley  
Fawell Manton  
Fazio Marlenee  
Fields Martin  
Fish Martinez  
Franks (CT) Mavroules

Stokes  
Studds  
Swett  
Swift  
Synar  
Torres  
Torricelli  
Towns  
Traficant  
Traxler  
Unsoeld  
Vento  
Washington  
Waters  
Waxman  
Weiss  
Wheat  
Williams  
Wise  
Wolpe  
Wyden  
Yates  
Yatron

Shaw  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skeen  
Skellton  
Slattery  
Slaughter (VA)  
Smith (IA)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (OR)  
Smith (TX)  
Snowe  
Solarz  
Solomon  
Spence  
Spratt

Stallings  
Stearns  
Stenholm  
Stump  
Sundquist  
Tallion  
Tanner  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Thomas (CA)  
Thomas (GA)  
Thomas (WY)  
Thornton  
Upton  
Valentine

Vander Jagt  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Walker  
Walsh  
Weber  
Weldon  
Whitten  
Wilson  
Wolf  
Wylie  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff  
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—8

Barrett Gray  
Foglietta Hopkins  
Gradison Lehman (FL)

□ 1543

Mr. STALLINGS and Mr. McCANDLESS changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. DIXON, OWENS of Utah, and MILLER of Ohio changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I was unavoidably detained during rollcall 101, the vote on the Frank amendment to H.R. 2100, the National Defense Authorization Act, because of a meeting I was involved in at the White House.

Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, during rollcall vote 102 on the Dorgan amendment, I was unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

## AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DORGAN OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment that has been made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

## SEC. 1. DEFENSE OFFSET PAYMENTS.

(a) DEFENSE COST-SHARING AGREEMENTS.—The President shall consult with foreign nations to seek to achieve, not later than six months after the date of the enactment of this Act, an agreement on proportionate defense cost-sharing with each foreign nation with which the United States has a bilateral or multilateral defense agreement. Each such defense cost-sharing agreement should provide that such nation agrees to share equitably with the United States, through cash compensation or in-kind contributions, or a combination thereof, the costs to the United States of maintaining military personnel or equipment in that nation or otherwise providing for the defense of that nation.

(b) CONSULTATIONS.—In the consultations conducted under subsection (a), the Presi-

dent should make maximum feasible use of the Department of Defense and of the post of Ambassador at large created by section 8125(c) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 1989 (10 U.S.C. 113 note).

(c) ALLIES MUTUAL DEFENSE PAYMENTS ACCOUNT.—The Secretary of Defense shall maintain an accounting for defense cost-sharing pursuant to subsection (a). Such accounting shall show for each such nation—

(1) the amount of cost-sharing contributions agreed to;

(2) the amount of cost-sharing contributions delivered to date;

(3) the amount of additional contributions of each such nation to any commonly funded multilateral programs providing for United States participation in the common defense;

(4) the amount of contributions made by the United States to any such commonly funded multilateral programs; and

(5) the cost to the United States of maintaining military personnel or equipment in that nation or otherwise providing for the defense of that nation.

(d) REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—(1) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 180 days thereafter, the President shall submit a report, in classified and unclassified form, to the appropriate committees of the Congress concerning efforts and progress in carrying out the provisions of subsections (a) and (b).

(2) Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, and each 180 days thereafter, the Secretary of Defense shall submit to the appropriate committees of the Congress a report containing the accounting maintained pursuant to subsection (c) of defense cost-sharing contributions.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, for too long, our military allies have enjoyed the protection of the U.S. defense umbrella without contributing a fair share to offset the enormous cost to the U.S. taxpayer. Just as it's time to demand fair trade, it's time to require fair shares for mutual defense.

## CHANGING POLICIES FOR CHANGING TIMES

In the late 1940's, the military threat to our allies and their weakened economies dictated that America shoulder the defense burden for the free world. Forty years later, the world has undergone radical transformation.

The Berlin Wall has fallen. People from what was East Germany have streamed into the West. Not with tanks and rifles but with shopping bags and deutsche marks. The Warsaw Pact has dissolved and the Soviet Union is struggling to keep from coming unglued at the seams.

Countries once razed by World War II have become economic superpowers in their own right. Japan's gross domestic product (GDP) is now \$2 trillion. A united Germany has \$1 trillion national output. Recent trade deficits with

these allies have been as high as \$55 billion and \$15 billion, respectively.

These are not war-torn, war-tattered economies; they are tough, shrewd international competitors. They have robust economies which give them the capability to pick up a larger—and fairer—share of the free world's defense.

But they have not.

Of total allied spending by NATO countries—some \$500 billion—Japan contributes a mere 6 percent and Germany only 7 percent. Others lag even farther behind. Not surprisingly, the United States contributes 61 percent of all defense spending for Western Europe and Japan.

Taken from another perspective, Japan spends only 1 percent of its GDP on defense and Germany budgets only 3 percent of its national wealth. Again, the United States allocates six times as much as Japan and twice as much as Germany for defense.

Why is it that almost 400 million Europeans with a collective economic output as big as our own need 300,000 American troops to defend them?

I don't mean to suggest that we should push for the rearming of Japan and Germany. Quite the contrary. By pressing for contributions from these and other allies to offset U.S. defense costs, we can relieve some of our budget pressures without triggering defense build-ups in these nations.

It's incumbent on us to change our policies to fit these changing realities.

The comprehensive amendment on burden sharing which I offer today to the Defense Authorization Act will move us down that road. I am pleased that our colleagues DAVID BONIOR, RICHARD DURBIN, and JOHN BRYANT are joining me as cosponsors of the amendment.

#### A TIMELY AND FRESH APPROACH TO A KEY ISSUE

The amendment takes a fresh approach to mutual defense costs by calling on the President to seek cost-sharing agreements with all nations with whom we have bilateral or multilateral defense pacts. It also breaks new ground by establishing an allies mutual defense payments account to track how much our allies are actually contributing in cash or in kind to offset U.S. defense costs. It further requires classified and unclassified reports to the Congress by the President on the success of his efforts to achieve cost-sharing agreements and contributions.

Our present policy on burden sharing affords no way to hold the administration accountable for its efforts to increase cost sharing by our allies. Nor is there a single account to track contributions. Another policy problem is that current reports to the Congress provide only piecemeal and incomplete information about certain allies. My amendment would rectify that and provide the Congress with the comprehensive and useful information it needs to make decisions on defense spending.

Our Government's success in building a Persian Gulf coalition and in obtaining billions of dollars of contributions from those partners should point the way for a new, vigorous and comprehensive approach to defense cost sharing. With shrinking defense resources and growing Federal deficits, I believe the House should overwhelmingly pass such an amendment.

#### A RELEVANT ISSUE

I worked closely with the Armed Services Committee in drafting an amendment which is acceptable to Chairman ASPIN. The amendment comports with current law and arrangements under which the Secretary of Defense and the Ambassador at Large—for burden sharing—seek to achieve equitable cost-sharing agreements with our allies.

There is also ample precedent for raising this issue on a defense bill. In the last 2 years, for example, the Bonior and Dorgan amendments on Japanese host nation support costs have put into law new mandates on defense burden sharing.

Let me also say that this country's gross indebtedness will increase by \$405 billion this year. That's borrowing \$1 billion every day, 7 days a week, all year long.

#### BIG SPENDERS FOR THE DEFENSE OF OTHERS

We directly spend \$28 billion a year overseas for the defense of our allies. We dish it out for 395 bases in 35 different countries. However, much of what we spend in the United States is for troops dedicated to defend others. Some experts say that we have been spending as much as \$200 billion a year for the defense of others. A conservative estimate for all such spending is \$100 billion annually.

Since we spend at least \$100 billion a year on the defense of our allies, it means that one-fourth of our budget problem stems from the failure of our allies to pay for their own defense. It means that every taxpayer coughs up an extra \$1,000 a year for the defense of other nations. It means that every man, woman, and child contributes \$400 to defend foreign nations.

So, strange as it seems, we are borrowing money from our allies to pay for their defense. That's not only goofy, it's unconscionable.

We seem to have very deep pockets for overseas defense spending when we can't balance our own budget—let alone support a decent farm program or provide basic health care for all Americans.

#### ALLIES GRADUATION AMENDMENT

Let's put an end to the free ride and demand a fair share. Our country can't afford to defend everyone else, while they bank the profits of their exports to the United States.

Even the Europeans themselves are raising questions about current arrangements. For example, the Secretary of the French Parliament's National Defense Committee said in 1988:

Do you think 320 million Europeans can continue to forever ask 240 million Americans to defend us against 280 million Soviets?

Let's allow our allies to graduate from being dependent on the United States. This graduation will require that our allies have a larger say on mutual defense questions. That's as it should be. But it will also require that our allies offset a larger amount of U.S. defense costs.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote for the Dorgan amendment and for effective cost-sharing agreements between our Nation and our allies.

Mr. Chairman, this is another burden-sharing amendment, but a different approach. I would like to explain it carefully so that everyone understands what I am trying to do. Ev-

eryone in the House will remember what happened with respect to Desert Storm. The President dispatched the Secretary of State and others around the world to negotiate with other countries their responsibility to help pay for Desert Storm. Actually they were quite successful in getting pledges and money into an account that had been established by Congress over in the Department of Defense. Billions of dollars were deposited in that account. More pledges remain.

It seems to me it is a successful model for what we ought to do, not just for the Desert Storm conflict, but also routinely year after year for the amount of money that I think is owed to this country by our allies for the amount that we spend on their defense.

My amendment does this: It establishes, first, an account called the allies mutual defense payment account in law.

Second, it requires the negotiation or consultation by the President with foreign nations to achieve an agreement with other countries for payments to that account in order that they share the burden for the defense spending that we exhibit now on their behalf.

It is very simple. We have done it for the Persian Gulf. I am saying let us establish a legal mechanism by which we can do it generally year after year.

Mr. Chairman, the committee is not in opposition to this amendment, as I understand it. The amendment is seeking to accomplish what we did accomplish in the Persian Gulf on a more routine basis year after year with other countries around the world. It does not bash our allies. It is not isolationist. It simply recognizes what is true.

Forty-five years ago this country, the United States, had to shoulder much of the burden to pay for the defense umbrella over the free world. We were the only nation that could, after all. We had the ability, and we had the responsibility.

Forty and forty-five years later, other countries, shrewd, tough, strong international economic competitors, some of them economic superpowers, still allow this country and its taxpayers to share the overwhelming bulk of the burden here.

It is time for us to ask the Japanese, the Germans, the French, many other countries, friends of ours, to help pay more of the bills. The U.S. taxpayers cannot carry such a big load any longer.

□ 1550

What I ask is the President negotiate with these countries to obtain offset payments, which would be put in the allies mutual defense payments account.

If Members oppose this, it can only be that Members want nothing to change. Let Members do it the old way, and Uncle Sam will pay the bill thinking we can afford it. Heck, we can do it for the rest of the world, send the United States the bill. If we think it is time for Members to change that, and ask our allies to do more, this is the time to make that change.

This amendment is simply an amendment that gives the President the authority and the charter to move forward and negotiate offset agreements. How on Earth can anyone oppose that kind of charter? It is not bashing anybody. That is the silliest kind of argument



I have heard on the floor of the House. It simply is an amendment to responsibly remove the American taxpayer's responsibility from the bulk of the burden, to pay for this free world defense umbrella, and ask others around the world to start helping.

Let Members stand up for the interests of this country for a change. That is what this amendment does.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, while everyone agrees with the general idea of burden sharing is unnecessary and redundant.

Cost sharing already exists. It is called NATO, with our European allies. Further, the United States has bilateral agreements with Japan and South Korea and many other nations on burden sharing. We cannot mandate other sovereign nations to contribute to the United States. We cannot mandate other sovereign nations to contribute. That has to come through mutual negotiations and discussions. That is ongoing and occurring right now.

I doubt that any Member in this body would disagree with the general premise that our allies throughout the world should assist with our mutual security arrangements.

This is a common sense, apple pie, motherhood, salute the flag type of issue. In many respects the 4-hour debate is somewhat of a smokescreen, changing the focus from the deep and abiding flaws in this year's defense bill, and it tends to place the blame for our own fiscal disasters on the shoulders of our allies.

The Constitution makes clear that one of the fundamental functions of the Federal Government is to provide for the common defense. Article I of the Constitution places the responsibility for raising armies and navies to the Congress.

Many in the Congress seem to ignore the constitutional mandate and seem apologetic, almost, about having to spend any money at all on defense. A few use every opportunity to take potshots at defense in general and try to slash defense programs at every turn.

The United States has the responsibility to itself and to its own citizens to ensure for the common defense. It is our duty to see that it is done. We cannot shirk this duty and look to others to solve our problems.

What has brought about this debate on burden sharing? To a large degree, it is the U.S. debt problems that have been caused by runaway Federal spending over many years, not just on defense, but on hundreds of new programs and bureaucracies. Too often defense spending has been singled out as the sole culprit and the scapegoat for excessive spending. The media and others have done a great job of convincing the public that if we cut the B-2 bomber, or close a few military bases, or reduce

the number of our armed services, our debt problem will be solved.

I do not know how many times ad nauseam I have heard the statement, "One B-2 bomber would buy this, that or the other thing." It sounds appealing to many people, but it is wrong to lead people that defense spending is the boogeyman.

A strong national defense makes everything possible. This world, contrary to popular belief, is still a very dangerous place. First and foremost in our minds, every American should ask, "Am I safer today against possible threats to or freedom, than yesterday?"

There are dangerous trends set in this year's defense bill which cannot and should not be glossed over by the burden-sharing debate.

Strategic modernization is the most serious problem facing the United States. Unfortunately, this year's bill largely ignores this important area of increasing U.S. vulnerability. How can anyone ignore the Soviets are continuing to modernize nuclear forces at an unprecedented rate. Are we too euphoric over the apparent end of the cold war to notice or to care? How quickly we forget. Indeed, how quickly things can change. That is the reason for the United States to be cautious. U.S. investment in strategic modernization, the B-2 bomber, MX, rail garrison, the small ICBM, are crucial for the United States to be able to retain a credible nuclear deterrent.

One thing is clear to me, Mr. Chairman. If we do not take steps to modernize our strategic nuclear deterrent, we will, in effect, be unilaterally disarming ourselves. Our national security is too important to gamble on. Our investments in this area are absolutely critical. Yet this topic was hardly touched upon during the debate on the defense bill.

Instead, we are clamoring to point fingers at our allies for our fiscal problems, and ignore our own weaknesses.

It has become popular in some quarters to bash Japan at every turn. During Desert Storm many were saying, why was Japan not sending more troops? Why did they not pay more? It was the United States that placed constitutional limits on Japan after World War II prohibiting it from amassing a large army or sending troops abroad.

Japan also has contributed toward Desert Storm costs, several billion dollars. True, there are many areas of imbalance with the United States and Japan, and that is something we are working on. Hopefully, things can be worked out.

The crucial point to be made is that we cannot allow the emotional debate on burden sharing and blaming others, and bashing Japan and Germany, to tarnish our mutual relationships. We must remember that Japan and Germany are important allies. Politically,

we share a common interest in democracy, peace, and stability throughout the world. Economically, the United States and Japan are strongly connected. The United States is the largest market for Japanese imports, and Japan is the largest market for United States agricultural exports, and the second largest for all exports.

The United States, like it or not, is the dominant power in the world today. The Soviet Union is a military superpower, but is an economic basket case. Japan and Germany are economic superpowers, but lack the military might to make them a military superpower. Only the United States, only the United States, has them both, military and economic.

For the last century or more, the United States has stood as a beacon of democracy and good will. As a superpower, we have a moral responsibility to ensure that these values are perpetuated. It is in our best interest to remain the position to be able to fill our role in the world. We should not allow ourselves to rely on other sovereign nations so much that we cannot take whatever action is necessary to preserve our interests.

Mr. Chairman, if we want to talk about U.S. economic weakness in our growing debt, let Members tackle this head on. Let Members be honest and debate that issue, taking into account all of the various that led to our current economic crisis.

That debate would include and not be limited to the lack of fiscal responsibility in this body. Pork barrel spending, which is rampant around this area, skyrocketing social programs that nobody likes to talk about on that side of the aisle, and cost curves, the lack of a Presidential line-item veto. Let Members take 4 hours on that. I used to be speaker of the house in my State. I saw the Governor use a line-item veto and bring things into play every year. Very easily he did that. Good Democratic Governor.

The balanced budget amendment, why not look at that? Let Members not blame other nations, particularly our allies, for their own lack of fiscal responsibility. Further, Mr. Chairman, let Members not allow this debate on burden sharing to cloud the real debate that should be taking place; namely, the adequacy of the defense of the United States of America.

Mr. BYRANT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRYANT. I would like to ask the gentleman if he bothered to read the amendment, because the amendment simply says that the President shall seek to achieve defense cost-sharing agreements within 6 months with all the nations we share bilateral defense arrangements, or groups like NATO.

What could possibly be wrong with that? Why take the time of the House to offer such an eloquent defense of the Japanese people who have vastly more money, vastly more economic power than we do, yet we continue to subsidize their defense, 46 years after World War II? Why not negotiate an equal sharing of the burden?

Mr. HANSEN. Reclaiming my time, let me say I would agree, yes, burdensharing is something we should be working on, but say we are not working on it, and say the State Department, Defense Department, and the administration are not working on it is absolutely not true.

We call down there and they said they are working on it constantly. We are working on agreements with the Japanese. I don't know if we want to put the administration through this, the cost, time, effort, put on another layer of government.

The question comes down to, why do we need it? I say it is redundant, unnecessary.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, my friend says that we already have burden sharing. He calls it NATO.

Would you give this stuff a rest with NATO? Japan, Europe, the United States, all the countries in NATO spend \$600 billion a year on defense, and guess how much of it is ours—61 percent. That is sharing?

I mean, give it a rest. There is no sharing. This country is the rich uncle. We pay most all of the bills and everybody else gets all the benefits.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the North Atlantic Assembly, which is the parliamentary arm of NATO, I have had occasion to go over these meetings and discuss this issue of burden sharing. I want to tell you, contrary to what the gentleman on the other side just represented, there is no real issue being discussed on burden sharing. As long as we keep paying the bills, they find a way in those countries not to even carry their fair share of the NATO burden that they agreed to and placed upon themselves.

Let me explain in a very quick way what this means. It means that every year since 1945 we have spent the lion's share to defend Europe. It means that by today in real dollars we have spent approximately \$2 trillion, almost more

than half the amount of our national debt.

The gentleman talks about pork barrel projects. The gentleman is absolutely making a mockery of the people of this country by talking about any kind of pork barrel projects that benefit districts in the United States, when you compare that to the \$2 trillion we have spent overseas that is not even matched by the allies who we are protecting.

As the gentleman in the well knows, that \$2 trillion could have been used to provide jobs for Americans, jobs for individuals, education for Americans, infrastructure for America and every other thing that this country needs today. It is an insult to all Americans to stand here now and watch the Mr. Bojangles of the other side dance like crazy, but not answer the real issue. Will we stand up for Americans and ask our allies to relieve us of paying the lion's share for their defense when there is no longer any enemy, by virtue of a good amendment of the gentleman from North Dakota which does not ask the President to do anything but negotiate with the people who are supposed to be our friends.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments. He is right on target.

Mr. Chairman, for more than 45 years the United States has defended freedom around the world.

But it is outrageous that we are still paying for the defense of countries that have the strongest economies in the world!

There are still 310,000 American troops stationed in Europe, even though the Berlin Wall fell in 1989 and the cold war has ended.

Germany has the highest standard of living of any nation in Europe, yet the United States has 227,000 troops—more than one-third of our entire overseas force—stationed there.

Japan has the world's second largest economy, with a gross domestic product greater than those of France, Britain, and Italy combined. Yet the United States still has 50,000 troops stationed in Japan for its protection, and they pay only 38 percent of the bill!

It costs the American taxpayer \$2.5 billion to station 40,000 troops in South Korea, yet the Koreans pay only 6 percent of the total.

That is outrageous!

Americans are tired of subsidizing our toughest trade competitors.

It is time to take care of our own.

Our Nation is in a deep and prolonged recession.

Unemployment stands at 6.6 percent nationwide, and more than 10 percent in my home state of Michigan. The American auto industry is on the ropes.

We need health care, education, and repairs for our highways and infrastructure.

For the last five decades, Americans have stood firm in defense of freedom. And we will continue to do so.

But it is time for our allies to begin sharing the burden for their own defense.

When you get tough on burden sharing, you get respect and you get results. As a result of our efforts last year, the allies in the Persian Gulf war went a long way toward anteing up their fair share.

But we need to keep up the pressure.

We will not dig into the pockets of American taxpayers to pay for the defense of countries like Japan when they close their markets to us.

I commend my friend from North Dakota, Mr. DORGAN, for his amendment today which will provide a comprehensive approach toward burden sharing.

It requires the President to negotiate equitable burden sharing agreements with each nation with whom we have a defense agreement.

And it sets up a mechanism, similar to the one we had in the Persian Gulf, so that we can track allied contributions to see who is paying and who is not.

It worked in the Persian Gulf, and it can work for all of our overseas commitments.

It is time to send the message that America will no longer squeeze the middle class, disrupt communities, and lay off workers at home while our allies get a free ride abroad.

That does not make sense and the American people will not stand for it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but what this amendment would make you feel good, but I want to just point out a couple things.

In recent years we have appointed an Ambassador at Large for Burdensharing. His name is Allen Holmes. He comes in front of our subcommittee at least annually, if not twice a year, to bring us up to date on the negotiations. I would point out as far as Japan and Korea are concerned, things are progressing rather well. These negotiations are going on, as you know, on a regular basis as far as NATO is concerned as well.

So I really do not know what this seeks to accomplish, except to make us feel good.

It does accomplish one substantive thing that I think my colleagues should be aware of. Last year Dick Cheney came to our committee and talked to many of us outside the committee as well, begging, "Please, would you give us a break. Enough already with the mandated reports."

This does not require an annual report by the President as to these nego-



tiations. That is the bad news. It requires a report on each of these negotiations twice a year to be prepared, sent up here and not be read.

I would suggest we take some pride in what Ambassador Holmes has done. I think this is unnecessary and redundant. I think somewhere along the line someone ought to take into consideration the successes they have had.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL], the chairman of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

□ 1610

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friends and colleagues here, the gentlemen from Michigan, North Dakota, Illinois, and Texas.

I commend them for offering it.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. As Operation Desert Storm has proven, it does not break the backs of our allies to ask them to pay their fair share toward the mutual defense of democracy in time of crisis, and it does not hurt them to share this burden in times of peace, either. It has to be observed that this country has defended the world since the end of World War II. We spend 6 percent of our gross national product on defense. Many of our allies spend only half that much. But Japan spends 1 percent of its gross national product on national defense. At the same time, that country and most of the countries that they defend, like Korea, are busily excluding American goods from their borders. Our automobiles are not permitted to be sold there; our services cannot be sold, insurance may not be sold there, our architectural and engineering services may not be sold in those countries. Every one of those goods is excluded from Japan to some extent.

Yet, our allies continue to expect us to carry the costs of defending the world.

The Congress has expressed its determination that the war pledges must be repaid with regard to Operation Desert Storm. Yet, there are still some \$17 billion owed to cover the cost of that war. This amendment may not be perfect, but it is a long stride forward. It says to our so-called friends and allies around the world, "It is your turn now to pick up the cost of this exercise."

The United States has done it for almost 50 years. The United States has grown very much worn and haggard in so doing. Our industry is run down, our infrastructure is decaying, our economic growth has been stymied, the welfare and the health of our people has been seriously impaired by the efforts which we have undergone. It is time our allies be told in a vigorous way by the administration that they have to make a contribution to these

efforts. Unless and until they do so, there is not much prospect of things turning better for this country.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I surely agree with the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] about people carrying their share, but I sometimes wonder as I listen to the people, are we listening? Are we tuned out on this?

The gentleman from Illinois talked about the 70 percent that Japan and Europe are both carrying. I think the intent is laudatory and has its genesis in good ideas, but what are we going to do with Mr. Holmes now? Does he get fired under this amendment? Here is a man who comes before our committee, he talks to us about burden sharing, that is what his job is, that is what he gets paid for. He goes to other nations and he talks to them constantly. He is doing a pretty good job. Does this say, "Mr. Holmes, this amendment takes your job away?" So, in effect we are going to create another layer of bureaucracy.

So I just say to the Members, why do they not think on this vote, if they want another layer of bureaucracy, more expense to the administration, another thing for Dick Cheney and his group to look at, which they look at thousands of requests from Congress and they all shudder when they get a congressional, they hate to have them. Let us give them a few more?

I would never question the genesis of this or its intent, but I do think it is another layer of bureaucracy. I do not think it is needed. I think Mr. Holmes is doing a good job.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want the gentleman to misread the amendment or to misunderstand the amendment. This creates no layer or no level of bureaucracy. This does not suggest the President hire anybody that is not now hired. It does not suggest he employ anybody that is not now employed.

It does establish a goal that requests him to negotiate with other countries to offset payments. It does say that we hope he would make maximum feasible use of the Department of State and the post of ambassador-at-large. But it does not mandate the President to create a new layer of bureaucracy.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman that this calls for the President to negotiate with all of these nations. Is he going to do it himself? Who is going to do it? I am sure President Bush is not going to get into an airplane and run around

talking to them; I seriously doubt that. But I do not know how we have ever put anything on this floor that somebody is not hired to do it, some group, some title, some new GS level is brought in. I do not know how that has been done. I have been in government 31 years, and I have never seen that occur. Maybe there is a way. I do not think there is. I think we have it in place. I say that respectfully; I do not know how else the gentleman would do it.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds. Let me just say we cannot debate this on both sides. First, the gentleman said cost sharing negotiations are already being done. Now he says he does not know who is going to do them. One or the other has to be true. If this is already being done and this amendment is irrelevant, that is one thing; I can understand that debate. But you cannot debate that and then say later on we are wondering who is going to do it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, Members of the House, the gentleman from Utah asked a moment ago or, rather, made an eloquent defense a moment ago, about the great job being done by our allies with regard to burden sharing. I find it distressing that Members of the House stand up and do for the Japanese and for the Europeans what they ought to be doing for themselves in negotiations. But that is exactly what is happening.

Let us talk about the burden being borne here. The fact of the matter is that today the European members of NATO have a collective gross national product greater than that of the United States. Yet, the people of the United States of America spend more on NATO defenses than the other 15 alliance members combined. Is that fair? Is that burden sharing? I do not think so.

What are we saying today? The pace of whatever it is that is being done is not fast enough. We cannot afford to keep borrowing money to pay somebody else's bills. I submit to you that Mr. DORGAN's concept is an excellent concept and I am delighted he brought it forward and permitted some of us to cosponsor it with him.

What does it do that is different? It is very clear what it does that is different. It establishes the allies mutual defense payments account. It is the Desert Storm concept made applicable to our burden sharing commitments with regard to the rest of the world.

This account would show the following: The amount of cost-sharing contributions agreed to by foreign nations and the contributions made to date, the amount of additional contributions

made by each nation so that we will know what actually is done, and the U.S. cost of maintaining the military presence in or defense of each nation. It puts it in very clear black and white language exactly what the commitments are and exactly what is being done and gets rid of the obfuscation which has dominated this debate year after year after year.

Stop defending the Japanese, stop defending the Europeans, start standing up for the American people. Let us tell them that it is time that they pay their fair share for their own defense and we begin to use the dollars of the American people for the benefit of this country.

Vote for the Dorgan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). The gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] has 7 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no other requests for time, and I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this country is a country that is large and strong and great, but this is a country that is beset with a number of problems. In the last few months, as we have discussed the health care crisis in this country, 40 million people who cannot get coverage, people who cannot afford the coverage they have, coverage being withdrawn, the only answer from the White House is, "We don't have the money."

As we try to help the people who are unemployed in this country, people who have lost their jobs, have the threat of losing their homes, the threat of losing their families, we are told, "We don't have any money."

When we see our schools going bankrupt, schools in crisis, we are told by the administration, "We don't have any money."

But they do not say that to our allies. They do not say that year after year after year, as this country pays a disproportionate share of the burden of defending the free world. But the Dorgan amendment simply sets in process a procedure by which the President can go out and negotiate those offsets and as he starts to save \$100 million or \$200 million or \$500 million, as he starts to get those contributions, maybe then we can start taking care of America, maybe then we can start taking care of people's health care and the education of their children and the higher education of their children.

All of the things now about which the only thing we hear from the White House is, "We don't have any money."

Well, "Mr. President, go out, negotiate with our allies, bring the money

home to America and start taking care of the people in this country."

The time has come for the Congress to adjust our defense spending and our defense obligations to a level commensurate with the New World Order we hear so much about.

The American taxpayer has been shouldering a disproportionate share of the peace-keeping and war-making responsibilities of the West for a half century. We maintain 375 major bases and hundreds of other installations around the globe in 35 countries: 19 major bases in Britain in 1989, 224 in Germany, 31 in Japan, 41 in South Korea, 11 in the Philippines, and on and on. That burden costs us over \$200 billion every single year.

That is more than one-half of a billion dollars a day we spent on Operation Desert Shield, where the immediate dangers and threats of war were certainly far more real, and the military capabilities of those we were defending more questionable.

That is the old world order, one that assured that we remained the preeminent power in the West, and that we were capable of responding to the threat posed by the Soviet Union.

But the world has dramatically changed.

Through a remarkable combination of our own successes and unpredictable Soviet failures, it is evident that the security needs of Europe and the Far East have undergone a dramatic evolution.

Nor are those regions any longer struggling to recover from the dislocations of a war now half a century old.

With the economic takeoffs experienced by the Pacific Rim and the EEC, the United States taxpayer is in the curious position of subsidizing the defense of nations whose economies are more modern and more vibrant than our own.

Yet we continue to shoulder an unreasonable proportion of the Defense burden.

Compared to allies like France, Britain, West Germany and Japan, the United States continues to spend substantially higher percentages of our GNP and our national budget on the military. On a per capita basis, the inequities are even greater.

With the Soviet Union gone as a credible threat, with Germany reunited, with Europe unifying through E.C. 92—why must our own taxpayers continue to spend \$½ billion a day on an archaic defense strategy?

Are we spending that money to defend Europe and Japan. Or are we locked into senseless spending to sustain a military machine in search of a mission?

I am not suggesting that Americans are walking away from their responsibilities. Anyone who thinks that is our case should review the recent experiences in the Middle East.

Let's remember that we are bearing enormous costs because of the obligations we took up in Kuwait:

We have already forgiven \$7 billion in outstanding debt owed us by the Egyptians;

We have made additional commitments of hundreds of millions of dollars to the Israelis to assist with war-related costs, and other policies;

We lost hundreds of lives and tens of millions of dollars in equipment in taking the major responsibility for Operation Desert Shield and Storm.

Nor are we turning our backs on our friends.

We are actively engaged in negotiations with both Europe and the Far East over trade policies to reduce barriers and bring our economies closer together. Indeed, it seems clear that in approving these treaties, Americans will lose jobs and both industries and regions of our own country will suffer.

Nor are we being closed minded in seeking savings only overseas.

We are all aware that proposals to shut down bases and facilities here at home are moving forward and that thousands of military personnel and their families, and local communities, are going to endure some very serious economic consequences of those decisions that are driven by the changing world security situation.

We cannot call upon our own citizens to bear those burdens without requiring our allies to adopt a more equitable burden sharing at the same time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield myself such time as I may consume in order to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from the Committee on Armed Services, from the State of Nevada.

Mr. Chairman, my understanding is, and I would like to confirm this with a member from the Committee on Armed Services, that we worked carefully with the committee on constructing language in this amendment, we worked carefully with the chairman of the committee and the chairman's representatives, and my understanding is that the chairman of the committee and the committee itself has not taken a position in opposition, that they have no objection to this amendment.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. BILBRAY. I thank the gentleman yielding.

Mr. Chairman, that is correct, we have no opposition and would accept the amendment.

□ 1620

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is my opportunity to close the debate on my amendment. I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). The gentleman from North Dakota is recognized for 2½ minutes.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, let me just restate briefly what we are talking about here. This is not a momentous policy change. This is not an amendment that is going to cause shudders around the world. This is an amendment that is very simple, working on the history of what was done in the Persian Gulf.



I have complimented, in my home State and here, the President on what he has done in the Persian Gulf in negotiating payments from other countries to help us pay for the costs of Operation Desert Shield and Desert Storm. It worked.

The fact is, Secretary of State Jim Baker did not get any sleep. He was shuttling all around the world negotiating offset payments into an account, cash and also payments in kind. It worked. They know how to do it.

The question is, Why just Operation Desert Storm? Why not every year?

I do not want to rearm Japan. I do not want to rearm Germany. I just want them to help pay the money necessary to help us defend the free world, because the American taxpayer cannot afford it any more. We cannot afford to do it virtually by ourselves any more.

It is not cost sharing when we pay 61 percent of the combined defense bill of all the NATO countries, plus Japan and us. We are paying far too big a share. And somebody, someplace, sometime has to stand up and say enough is enough. We are going to change it.

When better than right now for us to say we want our allies to help pay more of the bills?

The Secretary of the French Parliament's National Defense Committee said it best, I think. He said, "Do you think 320 million Europeans can continue to forever ask 240 million Americans to defend us against 280 million Soviets?"

Does anybody want to answer "yes" to that question? Of course not. All of us understand it is time for a change. This is the right kind of change. This is the time to change. This country is losing its edge. We all understand that.

We talk about cost cutting. Everybody here is for cutting costs, cutting expenses. What this amendment does is say, "Let us cut our costs overseas as well."

We are spending all of that money overseas that we ought to be cutting. How do we cut it? We get other people to contribute. So to those of my colleagues that are tigers in cutting here at home, I say: Be consistent. Let us chip in to cut overseas as well by burden sharing. That is what this amendment is about, Mr. Chairman.

I hope this House will take the first step here in saying yes, Mr. President, much was done right with the Persian Gulf. Let us do it right continually now with the rest of the world for the benefit of American taxpayer and for the benefit of the economic health of this country's long-term future. Vote "yes" on the Dorgan amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

# RECORDED VOTE

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 357, noes 58, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 102]

# AYES—357

Abercrombie	Dooley	Kaptur
Ackerman	Dorgan (ND)	Kasich
Alexander	Dornan (CA)	Kennedy
Allard	Downey	Kennelly
Anderson	Drieler	Kildee
Andrews (ME)	Duncan	Klecicka
Andrews (NJ)	Durbin	Klug
Andrews (TX)	Dwyer	Kolter
Annuizio	Dymally	Kopetski
Anthony	Early	Kostmayer
Applegate	Eckart	LaFalce
Archer	Edwards (CA)	Lagomarsino
Armey	Edwards (OK)	Lancaster
Aspin	Edwards (TX)	Lantos
Atkins	Emerson	LaRocco
AuCoin	Engel	Laughlin
Bacchus	English	Leach
Ballenger	Erdreich	Lehman (CA)
Barnard	Espy	Levin (MI)
Barton	Evans	Levine (CA)
Beilenson	Fascell	Lewis (FL)
Bennett	Fawell	Lewis (GA)
Bentley	Fazio	Lipinski
Bereuter	Feighan	Lloyd
Berman	Fields	Long
Beverly	Fish	Lowery (CA)
Bilbray	Flake	Lowey (NY)
Bilirakis	Ford (MI)	Luken
Boehlert	Frank (MA)	Manton
Boehner	Frost	Markey
Bonior	Gallely	Martinez
Borski	Gallo	Matsui
Boucher	Gaydos	Mavroules
Boxer	Geldenson	Mazzoli
Brewster	Geren	McCloskey
Brooks	Gibbons	McCollum
Broomfield	Gilchrest	McCurdy
Browder	Gillmor	McDermott
Brown	Glickman	McGrath
Bruce	Gonzalez	McHugh
Bryant	Gordon	McMillan (NC)
Bustamante	Grandy	McMillen (MD)
Byron	Green	McNulty
Camp	Guarini	Meyers
Campbell (CA)	Gunderson	Mfume
Campbell (CO)	Hall (OH)	Miller (CA)
Cardin	Hall (TX)	Miller (OH)
Carper	Hamilton	Miller (WA)
Carr	Harris	Mineta
Chapman	Hatcher	Mink
Clay	Hayes (IL)	Moakley
Clement	Hayes (LA)	Mollohan
Clinger	Hefley	Montgomery
Coble	Hefner	Moody
Coleman (MO)	Henry	Moorhead
Coleman (TX)	Herger	Moran
Collins (IL)	Hertel	Morella
Collins (MI)	Hoagland	Morrison
Condit	Hobson	Mrazek
Conyers	Hochbrueckner	Murtha
Costello	Horn	Nagle
Coughlin	Horton	Natcher
Cox (CA)	Hoyer	Neal (MA)
Cox (IL)	Hubbard	Neal (NC)
Coyne	Huckaby	Nichols
Cramer	Hughes	Nowak
Cunningham	Hunter	Nussle
Dannemeyer	Hutto	Oaker
Darden	Jacobs	Oberstar
Davis	James	Obey
de la Garza	Jefferson	Olin
DeFazio	Jenkins	Ortiz
DeLauro	Johnson (CT)	Orton
Dellums	Johnson (SD)	Owens (UT)
Derrick	Johnston	Pallone
Dicks	Jones (GA)	Panetta
Dingell	Jones (NC)	Parker
Dixon	Jontz	Patterson
Donnelly	Kanjorski	Paxon

Payne (NJ)	Santorum	Tanner
Payne (VA)	Sarpalius	Tauzin
Pease	Sawyer	Taylor (MS)
Penny	Saxton	Taylor (NC)
Perkins	Schaefer	Thomas (CA)
Peterson (FL)	Scheuer	Thomas (GA)
Peterson (MN)	Schiff	Thomas (WY)
Petri	Schroeder	Thornton
Pickett	Schulze	Torres
Pickle	Schumer	Towns
Poshard	Sensenbrenner	Traffant
Price	Serrano	Traxler
Pursell	Sharp	Unsoeld
Rahall	Shaw	Upton
Ramstad	Shays	Valentine
Rangel	Sikorski	Vander Jagt
Ravenel	Sisisky	Vento
Ray	Skeen	Visclosky
Reed	Skelton	Volkmer
Regula	Slattery	Washington
Richardson	Slaughter (NY)	Waters
Ridge	Slaughter (VA)	Waxman
Riggs	Smith (FL)	Weber
Rinaldo	Smith (IA)	Weiss
Ritter	Smith (NJ)	Weldon
Roberts	Snowe	Wheat
Roe	Solarz	Whitten
Roemer	Spence	Williams
Rohrabacher	Spratt	Wilson
Ros-Lehtinen	Staggers	Wise
Rose	Stallings	Wolf
Rostenkowski	Stark	Wolpe
Roth	Stearns	Wyden
Roukema	Stenholm	Wyllie
Rowland	Stokes	Yates
Roybal	Studds	Yatron
Russo	Swett	Young (AK)
Sabo	Swift	Young (FL)
Sanders	Synar	Zeliff
Sangmeister	Tallon	Zimmer

# NOES—58

Baker	Hancock	Michel
Barrett	Hansen	Molinari
Bateman	Hastert	Myers
Bliley	Houghton	Oxley
Bunning	Hyde	Packard
Burton	Inhofe	Porter
Callahan	Ireland	Quillen
Combest	Kolbe	Rhodes
Cooper	Kyl	Shuster
Crane	Lent	Skaggs
DeLay	Lewis (CA)	Smith (OR)
Dickinson	Lightfoot	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Livingston	Solomon
Franks (CT)	Machtley	Stump
Gekas	Marlenee	Sundquist
Gilman	Martin	Vucanovich
Gingrich	McCandless	Walker
Goodling	McCrery	Walsh
Goss	McDade	
Hammerschmidt	McEwen	

# NOT VOTING—15

Chandler	Gray	Owens (NY)
Foglietta	Holloway	Pelosi
Ford (TN)	Hopkins	Rogers
Gephardt	Lehman (FL)	Savage
Gradison	Murphy	Torricelli

# □ 1648

Messrs. COBLE, GALLO, ROBERTS, GALLEGLY, SPENCE, LAGOMARSINO, LEWIS of Florida, ZELIFF, COX of California, and HERGER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

# □ 1650

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. Cox of Illinois). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 9 printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BRYANT

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BRYANT: At the end of title X (page 180, after line 8), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1033. NUMBER OF FOREIGN NATIONALS AUTHORIZED TO BE EMPLOYED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—The number of foreign nationals who may be employed on the last day of a fiscal year pursuant to an indirect-hire civilian personnel agreement at United States military installations located outside the United States is as follows:

- (1) For fiscal year 1991, 57,459.
- (2) For fiscal year 1992, 38,306.
- (3) For fiscal year 1993, 38,306.
- (4) For fiscal year 1994, 38,306.
- (5) For fiscal year 1995 and each fiscal year thereafter, 19,153.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, beginning with fiscal year 1996, the President should achieve reductions (below fiscal year 1995 levels) in the cost to the United States of salaries and other remuneration of foreign nationals employed at United States military installations located outside the United States through agreements under which the host countries assume a greater share of these costs.

AMENDMENT, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. BRYANT

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment No. 9 in House Report No. 102-68 may be considered in a modified form.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment, as modified, offered by Mr. BRYANT: At the end of title X (page 180, after line 8), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1033. LIMITATION ON THE COSTS TO THE UNITED STATES FOR PAYMENTS TO FOREIGN NATIONALS EMPLOYED AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES.**

(a) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Notwithstanding the prohibition on the management of civilian personnel by end strengths contained in section 312, the number of employment positions on the last day of a fiscal year at United States military installations located outside the United States that may be filled by foreign nationals who are employed pursuant to an indirect-hire civilian personnel agreement and are paid by the United States may not exceed the following:

- (1) For fiscal year 1992, 57,459.
- (2) For fiscal year 1993, 38,306.
- (3) For fiscal year 1994 and each fiscal year thereafter, 19,153.

(b) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that, beginning with fiscal year 1995, the President should achieve reductions (below fiscal year 1994 levels) in the cost to the United States of salaries and other remuneration of foreign nationals employed at United States military installations located outside the United States through agreements under which the host countries assume a greater share of these costs.

Mr. BRYANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment, as modified, be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the modification?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I guess I have to rise in opposition so that I can get some time over here.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, today we have debated broadly the issue of burden sharing. This amendment, however, deals with a very specific program.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment deals with a very specific burden-sharing related issue, that of the practice of this country which has continued for a number of years of spending over \$2 billion a year to pay the salaries of foreign nationals who work in our defense installations which are there for the protection of their country.

Last year the House agreed with this amendment and agreed to phase this process out over a period of 4 to 5 years, reducing our expenditures in this area by 25 percent a year. It was dropped out in conference. This amendment is a repeat basically of last year's amendment.

I offer it to the House today, because I think it is a reasonable way for us to begin to cut back on the amount of money we are spending to defend our allies abroad, money which they should be paying for their own defense.

Two billion dollars is a large sum of money. It is something we can address immediately. The amendment proposes that we begin to take care of this matter at a rate of 25 percent a year up through 1995, the last 25 percent of which would be negotiated by our Government with the other governments.

I believe it is acceptable to the minority. I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] for examining it closely and for, as I understand it, agreeing to not oppose the amendment and to the Committee on Armed Services as well.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] that I agree with him on the issue of foreign nationals. As to whether this is the exact way to go, I am unsure at this point.

But I think we will have plenty of time to discuss this with the other body. They have been less than forthcoming in trying to resolve an issue

that, in some cases, has resulted in foreign nationals being able to get severance pay in excess of \$100,000 a person for bank tellers, and I think that is what moves this amendment.

I must tell the Members that there are Members on this side who have reservations and who are uncertain as to whether this is the way to go.

While I personally want to commend the gentleman for being aggressive in the area of foreign nationals, I want him to understand that there are Members on this side who have not crossed the "t's" and dotted all the "i's" and may have some objections. But I think we can take this into conference and hopefully get this issue resolved within this session of the Congress and not have to keep this thing around.

This is going to call for pretty broad discussions among everybody involved in the conference in order to get a resolution of this matter.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds simply to emphasize that this bill does not prohibit the hiring of foreign nationals. It simply says that we are going to stop paying for the hiring of them. They are going to be paid by their own governments as they should be.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. OAKAR].

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment, as I have supported the burden-sharing amendments.

I think the American people are saying Western Europe now can carry the lion's share of funds for its own security. Americans have spent more on NATO than all of the other European countries put together, and yet they have free health care, they have job training programs, they have affordable housing.

Just the other day we learned in committee something that is for the sake of the future of this country, my colleagues, and something that would perhaps cure diabetes, perhaps cure various forms of heart disease; we learned that if the committee has its will they are going to cut the space station.

The Japanese and the Germans and the French are dying to do space, and we want to give up and abdicate our role in that now also.

I say accept this amendment and all the burden-sharing amendments, and let us recapture that \$2 billion for the space station or health care or some other very fundamental area.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ERDREICH].

Mr. ERDREICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the burden-sharing amendments.



Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of requiring allied nations to shoulder a greater portion of the peacekeeping costs in our New World Order. I do not think the people of this Nation, or of my home county, envision a New World Order where the United States picks up the entire tab for freedom.

Each year, we spend about \$80 billion on the defense of Japan and Asia, and in excess of \$100 billion for the defense of Europe.

Many nations now enjoy the strong economies and freedoms of democracy. Those nations should pay their fair share to protect those freedoms. Certainly with the changed world condition and the growing economic strength of Germany and Japan, allied nations can shoulder a larger share of the burden.

We shouldered most of the burden for the cost of the war in the Persian Gulf. Some nations came through with assistance, others did not. Mr. Chairman, we have critical financial needs here at home. My home State is facing a budget crisis that has forced the most drastic education cutbacks in two decades.

It is past time for our allies to pay their fair share of security costs. That is why I support greater burden-sharing measures.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HUTTO].

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Bryant amendment.

As chairman of the Armed Services Committee's Readiness Subcommittee, I am all too familiar with this issue. The subcommittee has jurisdiction over the operation and maintenance [O&M] budget of the Department of Defense and the issue of foreign national employment.

Civilian personnel pay makes up about 41 percent of this \$90 billion O&M allocation with 1.1 million people on the payroll. When the Berlin Wall came down, we began to make painful choices on the budget as we worked to reshape our national security posture and meet the objectives of the budget summit.

The operation and maintenance account had to be reduced and reductions for civilian pay were unavoidable. DOD has testified before the committee that they plan to reduce the civilian work force by nearly 200,000 over the next 5 years. It seems a day does not go by where we hear of 200 of our people being laid off here, another 500 at a base over there, and so forth.

These are U.S. citizens with jobs that support U.S. families, and pay taxes both at the Federal and State or local level. That is why the subcommittee last year reduced pay for foreign nationals by \$324 million, and that is why Mr. BRYANT upped the ante on our reduction and called for a 25-percent reduction in this pay. The Secretary of Defense has exercised his waiver authority and will not dismiss these foreign employees at the rate mandated. Mr. Chairman, I do not see any waivers to base closures here in the United States, and I do not see any waivers when we have to fire Americans.

Mr. Chairman, the Readiness Subcommittee asked the administration for a planned and systematic approach reducing the civilian work force, both United States and foreign. Again this year we asked for such a plan. To this day the subcommittee has not received such a plan.

Mr. Chairman, last year when we held hearings on foreign nationals, we were shocked at the levels of pay and benefits provided to these foreign workers. I speak of benefits unheard of for U.S. workers. They get severance pay, even when the host nation throws us out. U.S. workers do not. They have "cure leave" if they are stressed out, and the U.S. taxpayer sends them to a spa to "chill-out." Many get such perks as shoe allowances, free transportation to and from work, United States and foreign holidays, education allowances, and language allowances. Many work less than 10 months and get 12 months pay. In some instances we pay them for 15 months while they only work 10 months. And, we have to pay them in foreign currency that has grown in value as our trade deficit mushrooms and the dollar declines.

It does not make sense to spend \$2.7 billion each year employing foreign nationals on our bases overseas while we are facing such major layoffs here in our own country. It is time these nations started paying for more of our costs, and foreign national civilian pay is a good place to start.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

□ 1700

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY].

First, I would like to thank the committee and the gentleman for examining this amendment and for, as I understand, not raising objections to it, and presumably supporting it.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, the House Committee on Armed Services does not object to the amendment and would accept the amendment.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH].

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I think we want to move on. I appreciate the gentleman's work on this.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT].

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. It is now in order to consider amendment

No. 10, printed in part 1 of House Report 102-68.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] rise?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MRAZEK

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MRAZEK:

At the end of title X (page 180, after line 8), insert the following new section:

**SEC. 1033. PERMANENT CEILING ON THE NUMBER OF UNITED STATES MILITARY PERSONNEL IN THE REPUBLIC OF KOREA.**

(a) **PERMANENT CEILING.**—After September 30, 1993, none of the funds appropriated pursuant to an authorization contained in this Act or any other Act enacted after the date of the enactment of this act may be used to support an end strength level of members of the Armed Forces of the United States assigned to permanent duty ashore in the Republic of Korea at any level exceeding a permanent ceiling of 30,000, of which not more than 20,000 may be members of the Army. In reducing the number of United States troops in the Republic of Korea to achieve this permanent ceiling, the President should consult closely with appropriate officials of the Republic of Korea.

(b) **REAFFIRMATION OF COMMITMENT.**—Congress reaffirms the commitment of the United States to the security and territorial integrity of the Republic of Korea and concurs in the decision of the President that reductions in the number of United States troops in the Republic of Korea can be made without adversely affecting the security of the Republic of Korea or lessening the commitment of the United States to its Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea.

(c) **TRANSITION FROM LEADING DEFENSE ROLE.**—It is the sense of Congress that the establishment of a permanent ceiling on the number of United States troops in the Republic of Korea in subsection (a) is—

(1) part of a transition for United States troops from a leading role in the defense of the Republic of Korea to a supporting role; and

(2) the beginning of the phased withdrawal of United States ground combat units from the Republic of Korea.

(d) **EXCEPTIONS.**—The permanent ceiling on the number of United States troops in the Republic of Korea; and

(1) shall not apply in the event of a declaration of war or an armed attack on the Republic of Korea—

(2) may be waived by the President if the President declares an emergency and immediately informs the Congress of the waiver and the reasons for the waiver.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and a Member in opposition will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both sides be given an additional 5 minutes apiece, 10 additional minutes to discuss this amendment.

In other words, instead of having a 10-minute debate on the Korean troop

withdrawal, it would be a 20-minute debate.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The time will be split between the proponents and opponents. The gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK] will be recognized for 10 minutes, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BILBRAY] will be recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment sets a ceiling of 30,000 United States troops in Korea, much as Congress set a ceiling on United States troops in Europe since 1985. It is an opportunity for the Congress to go on record for the first time in support of Secretary Cheney's determination that South Korea should begin to assume the lead role for its own defense, with the United States transitioning to a support role.

It is also a means of saving U.S. taxpayers \$1.2 billion by the end of 1993 and nearly \$1 billion a year after that, according to the Congressional Budget Office.

It is a very modest and prudent amendment. It simply calls for a reduction of 2,000 troops, per year, for 3 years, below the figure of 43,000 troops who are currently deployed on the Korean Peninsula, although 7,000 of whom Secretary Cheney has decided to withdraw over the same period. So each year we would withdraw an additional 2,000 troops.

If the President decided that there was a security crisis or an emergency, all he would have to declare is that he was concerned about the security situation on the Korean Peninsula, and he could void this legislation. I think it is important to recognize, Mr. Chairman, that there are 43,000 American troops currently deployed on the Korean Peninsula at a cost of many billions of taxpayers' dollars this year. They have been there since 1954. I think that many Americans are not aware of the fact that today there are 44 million North Koreans who we are there helping to protect, and there are 20 million North Koreans. There are twice as many South Koreans, in other words, as North Koreans, and yet we feel it is necessary for the United States to make this expenditure.

It is also important to note that South Korea has the most dynamic economy in the world today. They are not a fledgling nation, fighting for survival economically. They have one of the most successful nations economically in the world today. One of the reasons for that, clearly, is that they are not spending these many billions of dollars in their own defense. I guess I would submit to this Congress that it

is time to suggest to the Koreans, if it is important to have the 2d Infantry Division there, they ought to be picking up a far greater share of the burden.

This amendment does not require them to take on the entire burden. It simply suggests that we as American taxpayers can save \$1.2 billion according to the Congressional Budget Office that could be better utilized for more important national security interests here at home in the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, with that opening statement I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mrazek amendment, just as the House did last year.

There are six strong reasons for my opposition.

First, in a region where United States forces are just minutes from combat, the amendment potentially cuts United States ground combat strength, the 2d Infantry Division, in half without reciprocal reduction by the North Koreans.

Reducing the 2d Division—viewed by the North Koreans as the strongest sign of United States resolve to defend South Korea—will be seen as a sign of weakness. North Koreans have always taken advantage of any perceived United States weakness, or preoccupation with other areas of the world. That's how the Korean war started, and a reason why the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was attacked.

Second, the United States has begun to reduce our forces in Korea. By the end of 1992, U.S. strength there will be cut by 7,000. Further cuts will be announced by mid-1992.

Third, cutting U.S. ground combat forces is not likely to save money. In fact, given the limited United States troop strength available now to cover the vast Pacific region, any troops withdrawn from Korea would likely remain based in the Pacific, at an additional cost of up to \$1.5 billion, according to CBO.

Fourth, South Korea, since 1988, has begun to pay an increasing share of support costs for United States troops. In 1991, those payments will be in excess of \$150 million. Also, South Korea has agreed to assume the \$1 to \$3 billion cost of moving United States headquarters out of Yongsan.

Fifth, there continues to be tangible evidence that the United States is transitioning from a leading to a supporting role in the defense of Korea. The most recent evidence is that a Korean four-star general will take over from a United States officer command of ground forces.

Sixth, the North Korean threat has not diminished substantially. In fact, there is evidence to indicate that the

North Koreans are developing a nuclear capability.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the Mrazek amendment. The existing plan for United States troop withdrawals from Korea need not be rushed. Haste often makes waste, and the United States experience in Korea has been that waste is often measured in United States lives.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to tell everyone that there is not a more important vote that we will cast today. I would like Members to pay attention to the fact that this issue itself transcends the issue of burden sharing.

If trends remain as they are, we may be looking at the next Saddam Hussein in North Korea. They will have a nuclear weapon in 3 to 5 years. Do all Members hear that? A nuclear weapon in 3 to 5 years. The country already has three reactors, and is building a fourth.

□ 1710

It is constructing a uranium mine and a nuclear reprocessing plant. North Korea is a member of the Nonproliferation Treaty, but refuses to permit any inspection of its facilities.

Last week unusually high ground temperatures were said to have been detected in a North Korean nuclear facility. It is still unresolved as to whether there was an accident, but the possibility really exists that in fact there was with a nuclear facility that is bent on producing nuclear weapons.

One of the reasons why we argue that we can leave Germany is because of the increased warning time, but when it comes to the issue of North Korea, that does not exist. In fact, we are concerned that the North Korean's warning time for South Korea has been shortened to 24 hours.

When you combine North Korea's emerging nuclear capability and a short warning conventional attack capability, combined with the fact that its political leadership is unstable, irrational, and bloodthirsty. Kim Il-song, of course, killed 17 members of the South Korean delegation in 1987, and they killed 115 passengers on a Korean airline plane, we cannot trust this guy. He is a nutcase, Kim Il-song.

In 1950, when we began to withdraw troops from Korea, we gave him a signal. And what did he do? He invaded the south.

We do not want to give Kim Il-song an April Glaspie type warning. We do not want to give him an April Glaspie type message that whatever he wants to do in that peninsula does not matter.

There is not a more important vote that we are going to cast in this defense bill. The North Koreans are developing a nuclear capability with a nutcase as the head of that country.



Let us not make any signals that could be misinterpreted by that man.

And I am going to say this to you. The entire world had better wake up to what is going on in North Korea before we have got to put 500,000 troops over there at some point in the future and subject them to what could be weapons of mass destruction.

I understand what the gentleman is trying to do. It is the wrong message at the wrong time with the wrong country and the wrong wacko leader who is simply interested in reining destruction on all his enemies.

Please do not vote for the Mrazek amendment. Let us make sure that the world is firm in its resolve to deal with people like this who threaten the lives of innocent people around the world.

Please vote no.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would point out to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, that it is Secretary Cheney and President Bush who have decided that it is time to cut our troops in Korea on the peninsula. Let us get it straight.

The President and Secretary Cheney called for a reduction in real force terms of 7,000 troops.

My amendment simply calls for an additional 2,000 troops per year for 3 years, and the President can void the legislation if he decides that there is a serious security concern.

So this is not a unilateral movement over here on this side of the aisle. We are simply supporting an effort undertaken by the President and his Secretary of Defense.

Having said that, we share the gentleman's concern about the pursuit of the nuclear program by the North Koreans, but they are two separate issues. Reducing our forces in the Korean Peninsula by 2,000 troops a year is not going to affect the North Korean commitment one way or the other on the attempt to build nuclear weapons technology. One has nothing to do with the other.

What we are simply saying is that it is time to recognize that after investing \$100 billion of our national wealth in South Korea's defense, we have certainly accomplished some things. We know the qualitative advantage of our weapons over the Soviet weapons that the North Koreans have. We know that the ROK force of 550,000 troops, and there is a permanent South Korean Army of 550,000 troops equipped with all our best weapons, and I am sure that that man the gentleman referred to as a wacko is fully familiar with the performance of the Soviets' weapons against ours in the Persian Gulf.

But the nuclear program is a totally separate issue. I am sure that President Bush and Secretary Cheney are monitoring it carefully.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. FRANK].

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, my friend, the gentleman from Ohio, has said, "Don't vote for this burden-sharing amendment. It's not like all the other ones," which he was also against. People are always for the one that is not here and the one that is going to come.

Of course the North Korean regime is a terrible regime. South Korea is larger than North Korea, has a better industrial base. We are not talking about abandoning them. We are talking about continuing American support, but scaling it down some because North Korea has lost its Russian and Chinese allies.

Gorbachev went to South Korea to criticize North Korea.

We are not saying there are no threats. We are saying that threats diminish and that we ought to be able also to cut back.

My friend, the gentleman from Ohio, said that we warn the rest of the world that they better be careful, but the attitude that prevails in this administration says to them, "Don't worry. America will do it. America will be 911 for the world. America will be the universal donor. America will be the banker. We will pay for it all."

If we reduce troops some and other people in the world think it is a terrible problem, would it be unheard of that somebody would actually help us?

We did this with great effort in Desert Storm, but on an ongoing basis day in and day out, we ought to do it.

We have a terrible budget crisis in this country. We will be able to alleviate only if we stop the attitude that America will pick up everybody's tab everywhere, every time, every place.

We are still going to be under all these amendments we have talked about today, the biggest defender of everybody else. The question is can we reduce it some.

I would only add, I am sorry my friend talked about the April Glaspie warning. Let us talk about the George Bush-Jim Baker warning. April Glaspie was no free agent. Let us not pick on the Ambassador for doing her job. Let us talk about the people who gave her her instructions.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, shades of Jimmy Carter. Here we go again. Let's just destroy America's defense preparedness, the very thing that has deterred another world war for over 45 years and allowed us to deal rapidly and effectively with problems such as the one we just had in the Persian Gulf.

You know, I am getting tired of hearing the same people over here, the biggest spenders in this Congress, talk about cutting the defense budget.

You know, hearing the sponsor of this amendment mention the National Taxpayers Union is unbelievable. He has one of the worst records in the Congress, according to the National Taxpayers Union, and I am sure that so do all of the other sponsors of those amendments to cut defense spending here today. The Members who time and again offer these amendments would simply wreck the defense budget.

We all know how serious the problem is in North Korea today. As a former speaker mentioned, Kim Il-song is one of the most dangerous men in the world, and his heavily armed troops are literally minutes away from Seoul, the capital of the Republic of Korea.

If we had listened to these defense budget cutters over the past 10 years, the liberation of Kuwait would have gone about as well as President Carter's attempt to rescue our hostages in Iran in 1980. Saddam Hussein would still be sitting astride the Kuwaiti oilfields, threatening Saudi Arabia and the world's energy markets.

Our troops are in South Korea today defending that small nation from another dictator that threatens it from a short distance away. By deterring Kim Il-song from attacking, they are also serving to defend against communism and preserve the peace.

Vote against this amendment.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Well, we were all enlightened by that calm and prudent statement by my colleague, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York.

I think it could perhaps unintentionally send exactly the wrong signal to North Korea. We have an enormous stake in the preservation of peace on the Korean Peninsula. If Kim Il-song gets it into his head that we may eventually be withdrawing all our forces from that country, it could conceivably embolden him to launch another act of aggression against South Korea. Even if he does not conclude that we are going to withdraw all our forces, if he thinks there is going to be a substantial draw-down, his incentive to agree to concessions in the ongoing dialogue with South Korea that could reduce tensions on the Korean Peninsula as a whole will be greatly diminished.

Even if we were to withdraw the additional 7,000 troops called for by the gentleman's amendment in comparison to the draw-down already contemplated by the administration, unless those 7,000 troops were demobilized we would not save a cent anyway.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, I urge rejection of the Mrazek amendment and the preservation of peace in Korea.

□ 1720

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and only to respond for a moment to suggest that if Kim Il-song is going to be emboldened, he will be emboldened by Secretary Cheney and President Bush's plan to reduce by 7,000 troops our forces there. This additional redundancy of 2,000 per year at a savings of \$1.5 billion, according to the Congressional Budget Office, is not going to make the difference in terms of Kim Il-song's reaction to Secretary Cheney's policy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. OWENS].

Mr. OWENS of Utah. I would just urge Members to think carefully about what this amendment does and to consider the mathematics: 550,000 South Korean troops, 43,000 American troops. The Secretary would reduce that by 7,000. The very meager amendment of the gentleman from New York would reduce it over 3 years by an additional 6,000, leaving intact then almost 580,000 troops.

Now, how can you, by reducing 1 percent of the troops, how can you increase the threat of Kim Il-song marching across the border? It is irrational to think that that 1-percent reduction in troops which will save this country \$1.2 billion a year after the third year—it is ridiculous to believe that that will change the dynamics of the possible conflict between South Korea and North Korea.

Let us just think carefully; we need to chip away at these expenses—\$1.1 billion, \$1.2 billion, is a lot of money; that is not a reduced—a problem for the South Koreans.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Mrazek amendment, which strengthens an existing United States commitment to reduce United States troop strength in South Korea and to move from a leading to a supporting role in South Korea's defense. The administration announced its intention to withdraw 7,000 U.S. troops from the current level of 43,000. The Mrazek amendment would simply require the withdrawal of an additional 2,000 troops per year until 1993, or a total of 6,000 troops. The question is not whether there should be a reduction in U.S. force strength. That determination has already been made by the Secretary of Defense and the President. The question is only the pace at which such a withdrawal can be undertaken.

It is ludicrous to suggest that North Korea's decision to invade, or not invade, hangs on the balance of 2,000 American troops per year. After all is said and done, the United States will still have a force strength of 30,000; this on top of South Korean ground forces numbering approximately 550,000. This is more than a trip wire force. This is a substantial United States military presence, built on an ironclad commitment to South Korea's

defense. The effect of the Mrazek amendment, from the standpoint of military deterrence, is inconsequential. What is not inconsequential is the cost savings. If enacted, the Congressional Budget Office estimates that this amendment will save American taxpayers over \$1.2 billion by the end of fiscal year 1993, and then nearly \$1 billion per year thereafter. And it is totally inconsequential for South Korea's defense.

Those who oppose this amendment will say that North Korea has not changed. That may be true. But the world has changed around it. This amendment reaffirms the United States' commitment to South Korea's security and territorial integrity; a commitment set forth in our mutual defense treaty. The Mrazek amendment is fiscally responsible. It is militarily sound. And I strongly urge my colleagues' support.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MCCREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Mrazek amendment.

The DOD has begun a comprehensive, phased troop reduction that cuts 7,000 troops from Korea by the end of 1992, but which retains the 1st Infantry Division, which the United States commander in chief in Korea considers to be the minimum required United States ground combat capability. Adoption of the Mrazek amendment could require up to a 50 percent cut in the 14,000-man 2d Infantry Division.

Unlike Europe, the threat to security in the Korean theater has increased not decreased. Many believe the North Koreans are on the verge of developing nuclear weapons and further, the North Koreans have refused to agree to reasonable verification mechanisms and to adhere to the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty Safeguards Agreement.

Adoption of the Mrazek amendment and its unilateral force reductions simply sends the wrong signal at the wrong time to both the North and South Koreans. It undercuts any leverage the United States and our South Korean allies may have in ongoing or any future force reduction talks. And remember my colleagues, the overwhelming balance of forces in the region already favors the North Koreans.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. LAGOMARSINO].

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Mrazek amendment and urge my colleagues to defeat this measure. While I appreciate the good intentions of the amendment, now is not the time to take unilateral disarmament actions in Korea. While I was somewhat encouraged by the talks not long ago between the heads of government of the two Koreas, these talks really did not produce any significant changes in the security situation of the peninsula. In reality, North Korea has done nothing really to lessen its threats or change its dictatorial policies to warrant us lowering our guard. If enacted, I believe the Mrazek amendment could seriously jeopardize the security situation on the Korean Peninsula, in-

crease the instability, and raise the possibility of another war—not lessen it.

When President Carter proposed to reduce American troops in South Korea early in his administration, he met a storm of protest and provoked serious shock waves in United States-South Korean relations. It was a proposal that was ill-conceived, ill-timed, and ill-advised. Nothing has changed in the past 14 years to make those troop reductions any more appropriate.

We have witnessed a series of incredible events over the past year and a half, especially in Eastern Europe and to a lesser extent in the Soviet Union. We continue to witness real democratic change and political reforms in the Republic of Korea where free and fair presidential, assembly, and local elections have been held. Sadly, no such changes are occurring in North Korea. While Koreans in the south go to the polls to freely express themselves and build a better future, Koreans in the north live under the harshest of tyranny devoid of any real human rights.

The military threat from North Korea has certainly not changed. North Korea has not reduced its strength and the balance of forces remains greatly favored toward the north. It has 2 to 1 superiority in many key categories of offensive weapons. The north continues to procure sophisticated military equipment from the Soviets, like Mig-29 Fulcrum aircraft. North Korea continues to forward deploy hundreds of thousands of combat shock troops right along the DMZ poised offensively to attack the south. The north continues to build invasion and infiltration tunnels under the DMZ. North Korea is also believed to be working on developing nuclear weapons. Even the Soviets have expressed concern about this most destabilizing action. American soldiers along the DMZ must still carry loaded weapons on the ready because of the threats of the north. We cannot even trust—sadly through experience—the North Koreans from kidnapping or murdering, even mutilating with an ax individual soldiers along the DMZ. Why should there be a difference on the larger scale?

Accompanying North Korea's unchanged military posture is North Korea's unchanged aggressive policy. As I mentioned, while I was encouraged by the series of diplomatic initiatives between the north and the south, like the recent visit of North Korea's Prime Minister—unfortunately not a figure with much authority—to Seoul, the results of these meetings have been minor. They are steps in the right direction, but they are very small steps not warranting the significant actions of the Mrazek amendment. However, the overall North Korean policy of subversion, support for international terrorism, and opposition to any real political or economic reforms remains unchanged. North Korea remains a key supporter of Saddam Hussein's regime in Iraq and the radical clerics ruling Iran.

I have hope that changes may come to North Korea. The Soviets appear to be less willing to support their Stalinist allies and are concentrating instead on problems at home. Improved relations between the Soviet Union and United States have moved the world into a new post-cold-war period. However, as Saddam Hussein in Iraq has violently proven, this new world order can be subject to greater in-



stability as renegade dictators pursue their own agenda now that the type of containment of conflict governed by American-Soviet rivalries is becoming removed, Kim Il-song is just as dangerous as Saddam Hussein in many of the same ways. In fact, they're probably more dangerous. North Korea is a more tightly controlled state, less dependent on international trade. I do not believe North Korea would make some of the same stupid strategic and tactical military mistakes made by Saddam Hussein.

Our decision on the Mrazek amendment is also a test of our resolve. Passing this amendment, I believe, signals that we believe the North Korean threat has diminished even though it has not. It could serve in the worst case as green light to Kim that now is the time to take action, even military action, to attain his objectives in the south. And, with many of our forces still committed to the Persian Gulf, we are stretched thin to react. Unlike in the Persian Gulf, I doubt the Chinese and the Soviets would support U.N. action for South Korea. The Soviets promised never to repeat 1950. Further, in his resignation speech, former Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze warned the West of the growing strength of the hardliners in the Soviet Union and noted that his policy of supporting American and U.N. efforts in the gulf no longer represented the majority view of those in charge. In other words, U.N. action similar to what we saw in the Persian Gulf is doubtful should a crisis erupt in Korea. And, with Soviet aid diminishing, South Korea getting stronger both militarily and economically, and North Korea unable to keep up, time is not in Pyongyang's favor.

However, even if North Korea does nothing, the removal of many United States forces and the capping of Army—ready ground forces—at 20,000 by next year means we, and that includes our South Korean allies, will not have the capability to withstand an attack—or the pressure—from the north. And, with many of our forces still in the gulf, we have few Ready Reserves and woefully insufficient transport capability to bolster our smaller contingent in Korea.

The Mrazek amendment turns the United States forces in Korea into a trip-wire—a very costly one. There would be enough Americans in Korea to sustain very high casualties, yet not enough to really contain the north. From a security standpoint this is one of the worst situations in which to be.

We should know by now through many painful experiences that unilateral disarmament does not work when confronting aggressive, repressive dictators. Similarly it will not work in Korea and, in fact, increases the possibilities of war and instability. Furthermore, we should not be weakening our capabilities and hope that the North Koreans will follow suit. There is certainly no internal public pressure for them to do so.

The United States is in Korea because it is in our own national interests to be there. The Korean Peninsula is a strategically located dagger pointed at Japan, one of our largest trading partners, the North Pacific, our maritime backyard, and wedged between China and the Soviet Union. With South Korea itself having become a significant trading partner

with us, our interests in keeping the Republic of Korea free have not changed since we went to war in 1950.

There has been significant change in South Korea. Economic and political reforms that are unparalleled in the north. New trading relations with the Soviet Union and China. Renewed interest and growing acceptance of admitting Korea—both north and south—into the United Nations. Further, as Korea advances it is able and presently is addressing the burdensharing issue. Korea sent medical teams and transport aircraft to the Persian Gulf. Last year alone Korea increased its in-country support for United States troops by 115 percent covering some local labor and local United States military construction costs. The Koreans will pay 100 percent of the costs associated with moving our headquarters out of Seoul to a more suitable site in Korea. Yes, more needs to be done by the Koreans and I know that the Pentagon is negotiating right now on this very subject.

I look forward to the day when what is called for in an amendment like Mr. MRAZEK's is timely and helpful. However, today is not that day. The ball is in North Korea's court to make the kind of military, political, and economic changes—real changes and actions, not cosmetic ones designed to woo public opinion in the south and the United States—that will facilitate force reductions on the Korean Peninsula. We've fought a war costing millions of Korean and American lives to protect freedom, liberty, and democracy in Korea. We cannot gamble the sacrifices and freedom, liberty and South Korea away on the naive wish that North Korea will be accommodating—especially since the north through its actions is showing just the opposite.

We had a war in Korea in the 1950's caused, at least in part, by signals from the United States. Let us not do it again.

This amendment strikes at the long, solid United States-South Korean relationship. South Korea is a strategic interest of the United States, not to mention an important trading partner. This amendment jeopardizes that relationship and the gains we have made. I very strongly urge my colleagues to reject this dangerous amendment.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Chairman, I am so disappointed, first of all, that my colleague from Massachusetts has left the floor. I want to say to him and the gentleman from New York that this idea that we ought to be passing amendments that put together what can only be defined as illusory savings at a time when we have a man who is actively developing nuclear weapons, who is building his conventional capability, where we have a 24-hour warning time on the Korean peninsula, and we sit here and talk about burden sharing; it is beyond my understanding.

If there is any message that this Congress ought to send in light of the contradictory message that we sent Sad-

dam Hussein, it is that we ought to be very, very clear that the world stands united and unflinching in regard to a guy like Kim Il-song.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one very important point. We only get a saving of \$1.5 billion if all of these troops are actually demobilized. If they are redeployed elsewhere, as they probably will be, we save nothing.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, we live internationally in a world of signals. Back in 1950, in a speech given by Dean Acheson stating the area of influence of the United States, it evidently left out the peninsula of Korea. North Korea felt free to go south.

Back in 1939, this Congress of the United States did not fund moneys for the Guam Harbor rehabilitation and construction there, and Japan was encouraged—it gave them a signal that we would not defend our interests in the Pacific. Consequently, World War II was on its way.

Last year, the administration announced that it would reduce the present force by 7,000 over a 3-year term. I think that that is enough. If we pass this amendment, it is sending a signal from the people of the United States that our interests are not there in Korea, in South Korea. We recently fought a war against a Third World despot because he thought we would not respond to his aggression against Kuwait.

We must reject this amendment.

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, on this final 30 seconds I would simply suggest to my colleagues that Kim Il-song got a signal all right, he got a signal when the Iraqi air force was wiped out on the ground, he got a signal when the super-hardened bunkers of Saddam Hussein were destroyed by smart bombs, he got a real good signal.

Now, we have a chance to start saving some real money here because just as President Bush has called for removing those 7,000 troops, which he is reducing on the Korean Peninsula, in the force structure there we call for the same thing, a reduction in the force structure of 2,000 a year over 3 years, \$1.5 billion savings and \$1 billion a year after that.

I submit to you that the American people fully recognize that we have some new national security interests here at home. Let us start addressing them.

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the committee, I would like to express our views again. The committee has not been one of those that have opposed every burden-sharing amendment. Three out of the five the committee has accepted and supported. Two of them we opposed. For those who mentioned this side of the aisle against that side of the aisle, that has not been the case in the committee. The committee, composed of both Democrats and Republicans, have supported three of the five amendments and opposed two.

We oppose the Mrazek amendment; we think it is irresponsible; it does not protect the remaining troops that remain in the demilitarized zone area. We believe firmly that everyone should recognize the committee has studied this area, they have heard testimony, and we believe it is a bad amendment that should be denied for the protection of American security as well as those young men and women of the 20th Infantry mechanized regiment, which I once served in, who serve along that line, who need our help and support.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MRAZEK].

The question was taken; and the Chairman pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MRAZEK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 275, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 103]

## AYES—143

Abercrombie	Donnelly	Jontz
Anderson	Dorgan (ND)	Kanjorski
Andrews (ME)	Downey	Kennedy
Andrews (TX)	Duncan	Kildee
Annuzio	Durbin	Klecza
Applegate	Dymally	Kolter
Atkins	Early	Kostmayer
AuCoin	Eckart	Lehman (CA)
Bellenson	Edwards (CA)	Lewis (GA)
Bereuter	Engel	Lipinski
Bonior	Espy	Markay
Borski	Evans	Martinez
Boucher	Flake	Matsui
Boxer	Ford (MI)	McDermott
Bruce	Ford (TN)	McMillen (MD)
Bryant	Frank (MA)	McNulty
Cardin	Gaydos	Mfume
Carper	Gejdenson	Miller (CA)
Clay	Gonzalez	Miller (OH)
Collins (IL)	Gordon	Mineta
Collins (MI)	Guarini	Mink
Condit	Hall (OH)	Moody
Conyers	Hayes (IL)	Moran
Costello	Hayes (LA)	Mrazek
Cox (IL)	Hefley	Nagle
Crane	Hertel	Natcher
DeFazio	Hochbrueckner	Neal (MA)
DeLauro	Hubbard	Nowak
Dellums	Jacobs	Oberstar
Derrick	Johnson (SD)	Obey
Dingell	Johnston	Owens (NY)
Dixon	Jones (GA)	Owens (UT)

Payne (NJ)	Sangmeister
Pelosi	Savage
Penny	Scheuer
Perkins	Schroeder
Pickle	Schumer
Porter	Serrano
Poshard	Sikorski
Rahall	Slaughter (NY)
Rangel	Smith (FL)
Rohrabacher	Stark
Rostenkowski	Stokes
Roth	Studds
Roybal	Swift
Russo	Synar
Sabo	Torres
Sanders	Towns

Trafigant
Traxler
Unsold
Vento
Washington
Waters
Weiss
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wolpe
Wyden
Yates
Yatron

Slaughter (VA)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stump

Sundquist
Swett
Tallon
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Visclosky

Volkmmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Waxman
Weber
Weldon
Wise
Wolf
Wylie
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

## NOT VOTING—12

Barton
Foglietta
Gephardt
Gradison

Gray
Holloway
Hopkins
Jefferson

Lehman (FL)
Murphy
Rogers
Torricelli

□ 1745

Mrs. BENTLEY changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the drug interdiction provisions in H.R. 2100, National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal years 1992 and 1993. As reported, H.R. 2100 authorizes a total of \$1.1 billion in fiscal year 1992 for drug interdiction activities of the U.S. military, \$25 million less than the administration's request. To fund congressional priorities in DOD's drug interdiction activities, including the addition of \$40 million for law enforcement support not requested by the administration, the Committee on Armed Services made a number of reductions in administrative overhead and eliminated some programs that do not materially affect the department's drug interdiction mission.

As chairman of the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I have long maintained that the illicit narcotics trade is a serious threat to our national security. I am pleased that the Department of Defense now clearly recognizes that the drug problem in the United States is a national security issue and has embraced the responsibilities the Congress has assigned to it in support of our antinarcotics efforts. I commend the Armed Services Committee for delineating the DOD's antidrug missions in statute, for insisting on an active DOD role in support of the war on drugs, and for authorizing the resources for DOD to carry out its job.

I agree with the statement of the Armed Services Committee that,

Whereas air-borne drug smugglers previously penetrated our borders with impunity, they are now being forced to land and off-load their drugs further and further from our homeland. Representatives of law enforcement agencies say DOD support is better now than it has ever been, and there is real synchronization of efforts among all participating agencies.

In fiscal year 1990, DOD did not spend \$40 million which had been authorized for law enforcement support. Although Congress provided \$50 million for such support for 1991 and, at the request of DOD, clarified ambiguities in the law with respect to the use of such funds, DOD did not request any funding for law enforcement support activities for 1992.

The budget request also includes \$154.4 million for the National Guard in support of

## NOES—275

Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Andrews (NJ)
Anthony
Archer
Armey
Aspin
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Bateman
Bennett
Bentley
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bunning
Burton
Bustamante
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Coleman (TX)
Combest
Cooper
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
Darden
Davis
de la Garza
DeLay
Dickinson
Dicks
Dooley
Doollittle
Dornan (CA)
Dreier
Dwyer
Edwards (OK)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
English
Erdreich
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Feighan
Fields
Fish
Franks (CT)
Frost
Galgely

Gallo
Gekas
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Goodling
Goss
Grandy
Green
Gunderson
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hancock
Hansen
Harris
Hastert
Hatcher
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hoagland
Hobson
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Jones (NC)
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennelly
Klug
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lent
Levin (MI)
Levine (CA)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lightfoot
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Lukens
Machtley
Manton
Marlenee
Martin
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum

McCrery
McCurdy
McDade
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
Meyers
Michel
Miller (WA)
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morella
Morrison
Murtha
Myers
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nussle
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pease
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Ramstad
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Roukema
Rowland
Santorum
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schulze
Sensenbrenner
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery



State plans. State National Guards assist local law enforcement by aerial and ground surveillance, marijuana eradication, transportation of law enforcement personnel, and cargo, container and vehicle searches at land and sea ports of entry. The real battle against crime in this country is fought by State and local law enforcement agencies which conduct over 90 percent of the law enforcement activity in our Nation. Much of this crime is a result of our national drug problem. I fully support the request for National Guard support of State and local antidrug enforcement as an investment in reducing drugs and crime.

America's military services are making an important contribution to the war against drugs. The funds contained in H.R. 2100 will allow these activities to progress on schedule. For this reason I strongly support their inclusion with H.R. 2100.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to announce to the members of the committee that we have just had our last legislative vote for the day. I would like to enter into a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] about the future schedule with regard to the DOD bill. I would like to state, with the approval of the gentleman from Alabama, what we thought we would do tonight is have some colloquies. We have some colloquies that are a very important part of the legislative process that we would like to do tonight. After we complete that, we would have completed all business on the DOD bill tonight.

Tomorrow we will come in at 10 o'clock and finish the DOD bill. What we have remaining after tonight are some amendments from individual Members, most of which will be offered en bloc tomorrow. Six of them have not been worked out to be part of the en bloc amendments. They will be voted on, after 5 minutes of time on each side. We will have 5 minutes on each side on each of six amendments, and cluster the votes at the end. When we finish the votes on those, we will vote on the en bloc amendments, and then be finished with the DOD bill.

□ 1750

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has explained the situation as I understand it, and of course the en bloc amendments will be presented as a group because they are all agreed to, so there is no reason to vote on that.

So, as the gentleman has outlined the agenda, what would be his estimate as to the amount of time it would take and when we might finish the DOD bill tomorrow?

Mr. ASPIN. I think we will finish the DOD bill sometime tomorrow about 1 o'clock.

Then, of course, we have other business, which includes the approval of the conference report on the budget

and a few other things for tomorrow as well. So after the DOD bill we still have other business.

Mr. DICKINSON. But by coming in at 10, it would be the gentleman's best judgment that we will conclude it in 3 hours on the floor anyway?

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DICKINSON. I want to tell the gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that I appreciate him working with us.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for an additional 15 minutes because we have a number of colloquies to go through, if I may ask the indulgence of the House.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, for the first colloquy, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an inquiry as to the meaning of a particular section of language in the report. It is my understanding that section 213 of the bill authorizes \$857.5 million for joint tactical missile defense. The language further states that the committee intends that up to \$20 million of these funds be made available for additional improvements in Patriot missiles and Patriot deployability.

It is my understanding that the \$20 million is additional Patriot funding and is in addition to those funds in the \$857.5 million which are already identified for Patriot upgrades.

Is that correct?

Mr. ASPIN. Yes, the gentleman from Massachusetts is correct in the way he has described the situation.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, it is clear that the defense procurement budget will be significantly reduced in real terms over the next decade. The survival of a great number of small firms that act as vendors to the Department of Defense or as subcontractors to the major Department of Defense prime contractors is a very serious issue that must be addressed. At the same time, the need for additional small firms to qualify as defense suppliers is not being met.

Congress and the Department of Defense must play a direct role in bolstering the current and potential domestic defense small firm supplier base. It can do so by supporting the manufacturing technology development and deployment programs of the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences [NCMS]. A nine point strategic manufacturing

technology initiative has been launched by the National Center for Manufacturing Sciences that will strengthen and expand the infrastructure for the domestic defense subcontractor base. This bill incorporates many aspects of the NCMS and its efforts be supported.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the Armed Services Committee can be assured that the committee is cognizant of the importance of the small manufacturing business base that provides support to our national defense. The committee continues to strongly support the activities of the NCMS, and the committee report indicates that the committee is in general agreement with the NCMS fiscal year 1992 plan and suggests that NCMS continues to work with the Department of Defense to achieve those objectives.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, one problem for small businesses that utilize or would like to learn state-of-the-art manufacturing technology at a teaching facility is that they are unable to win contracts for spare parts or manufactured goods which could ordinarily be set aside for small businesses because the Department of Defense feels it does not have the authority to make such awards.

Does the chairman agree that the House Armed Service Committee initiatives in manufacturing technology support the NCMS's continued efforts to work with the Department of Defense and small businesses to provide more opportunities for small manufacturing businesses while helping these teaching facilities?

And further, does the chairman agree that it is vitally important that the Department of Defense should continue to work with small businesses and the NCMS teaching factory network to explore methods by which the Government can support the education and training of these businesses while increasing our supplier base.

Mr. ASPIN. That is correct. I agree that the manufacturing technology initiatives that were recommended by the committee can work to those ends and believe that the committee should work toward removing the obstacles that prevent small businesses from participating in the Department of Defense contracting process.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee for his continuing support.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Chairman, I would now like to engage in a colloquy with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY].

I understand that the Environmental Restoration Panel held hearings on April 23 and 24, on the progress the Department of Defense is making in cleaning up contamination on military bases and contractor-related problems

in executing the DOD cleanup program. How did DOD assess its progress, and what are its major cleanup goals?

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield I am glad to respond. The private sector is a key and necessary ingredient if we are ever to clean up environmental problems on DOD bases. In that respect, Secretary Tom Baca, the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Environment, stressed the need to find ways to: Shorten the cleanup process; make use of partial remediation to get results sooner, and emphasize the importance of cutting through the bureaucratic redtape that is bogging down the cleanups at DOD bases.

Secretary Baca also emphasizes that a business-as-usual approach to DOD cleanup would not permit the Department to achieve its goal of having all cleanup actions under way by the year 2000.

Mr. ASPIN. Did the contracting community have ideas about how the Department could accomplish those goals?

Mr. RAY. Mr. Chairman, the industry representatives made a number of suggestions to insure that qualified contractors were available for DOD cleanup work and to expedite the cleanup process.

To their credit, they recognized the need for a risk-sharing approach that would provide a more equitable way to address the substantial liabilities associated with a high risk business like environmental cleanup.

They were also concerned about the future availability of bonds, which are required by law for cleanup work, if statutory relief was not provided to limit the extent of future liability for the bonding companies.

There also was general agreement that an integrated or turn-key or fast-track type of approach to environmental restoration—along the lines set forth in last year's base closure model program—is needed, necessary, and often appropriate. It has the potential for accelerating the pace of cleanup, and should be vigorously explored. I have talked at length with Secretary Baca regarding the merit of this approach, and other contracting innovations, and I am assured that the Department is actively considering such incentives for rapid and cost-effective cleanup.

The panel plans to hold additional hearings on the DOD cleanup program and will look into ways to improve DOD's management and to streamline the cleanup process. We will keep the committee fully informed regarding our findings and recommendations for policy guidance and legislative action.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAY], very much for his help on this issue, and I congratulate him for his leadership on the environmental panel.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of a colloquy I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER].

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage in a colloquy with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services concerning applications of funding for the X-Ray Lithography Program. Mr. Chairman, is it true that the intent of the X-Ray Lithography Program was expanded in the committee's Defense authorization report to Congress to include a wider range of applications of the x-ray lithography technology?

Mr. ASPIN. That is correct.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman agree that x-ray lithography can also contribute to medical research and, in particular, the potential to do coronary angiography, and that some of the funds provided for the X-Ray Lithography Program were to pursue such research?

Mr. ASPIN. I agree.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. I thank the distinguished chairman.

□ 1800

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. PANETTA] for a colloquy.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, taking note of the wide and strong support of the full House of Representatives for the amendment requiring the expeditious completion of studies preparatory to environmental restoration projects at military installations slated for closure and designated as Superfund sites, I would ask the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee to affirm the commitment of the House of Representatives to the amendment.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's serious commitment to this important, noncontroversial, and urgent provision. While I believe that the other body will accept this amendment without change, I can assure the gentleman that I would work very hard to protect the amendment in its present construction should that become necessary in conference.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to know that I greatly appreciate his assurance, and I look forward to continuing to work closely with him on this and many other important issues.

Mr. ASPIN. I thank the gentleman for his help.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] for a colloquy.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, the authorization increases DOD medical research by \$91 million, directing the money for research into combat casualty care, burn treatment and infectious disease research. However, the authorization does not identify with specificity potential areas of research.

I would like to inquire if you consider the following research areas within those broad categories identified by the Defense authorization:

#### COMBAT CASUALTY CARE

First, research involving synthesis of bone material to replace fractured or shattered bones;

Second, rehabilitative medicine including orthopedics and orthotics;

Third, tissue regeneration and microsurgery techniques, involving limb reattachment; and

Fourth, surgery support, such as absorbable plate and wound closure.

#### BURN AND SHOCK TREATMENT

First, research involving stabilization and treatment of burn and shock victims and the protection of the immunity system; and

Second, research to promote the development of optimum resuscitation fluids.

#### INFECTIOUS DISEASE RESEARCH

First, research involving parasitic, viral and bacterial infectious diseases; and

Second, tropical diseases, such as malaria and schistosomiasis, as well as hepatitis and meningitis.

Would these research areas correspond to the committee's concerns for combat casualty care, burn treatment and infectious disease research?

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell the gentleman and the House that my staff has had a chance to review the list as proposed by the gentleman from Illinois, and we agree with him and believe that they would be covered as the gentleman has explained.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the chairman. I am also concerned by legislative language which links eligibility for research grants under this authorization to institutions which have achieved "national recognition for work in the [research] field." This language should not, in any way, restrict those universities and medical schools, though perhaps small or regional, which have, nevertheless, established a strong reputation for quality research in a given field. I refer to schools such as Creighton University in Nebraska, Meharry Medical College in Nashville, Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia, Medical College of Wisconsin in Milwaukee, or Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, Springfield.

Is it fair to assume that eligibility can be established through citation of previously recognized work or publications within a given field?

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct. I think that is a fair assumption.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman for clarifying these important issues.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his time and his attention to these issues.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ECKART] for a colloquy.



Mr. ECKART. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ASPIN], the chairman of the committee, to engage in a colloquy on proposed cuts in reserve force structure.

Mr. ASPIN. I will be happy to do so.

Mr. ECKART. I thank the gentleman. As you are aware, I am very concerned about the Army's plan to inactivate a large number of Reserve and Guard units, including the 107th Armored Cavalry Regiment located in my State. I understand that H.R. 2100, as reported by the committee, will help to protect against the large-scale decimation of such units.

Mr. ASPIN. The gentleman is correct. The President's budget proposed a cut of 107,000 in Selected Reserve end strength in fiscal year 1992 alone, the bulk of that from the Army Reserve and Army National Guard. While the committee recognizes that some downsizing in the Reserve and Guard may be necessary as a part of the 25-percent force structure reduction planned by mid-decade, the committee is opposed to the disproportionately large cuts in Selected Reserve end strength proposed by the administration. H.R. 2100, therefore, restores two-thirds of the end strength reduction originally programmed for fiscal year 1992. This end strength add-back will protect the Army Reserve and National Guard from the large-scale deactivation of units that the President's budget envisioned.

Mr. ECKART. I am very relieved to hear that the committee's action will protect and keep open a large number of units that would otherwise have been eliminated. I thank the chairman for his time and assistance in this matter.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] for a colloquy.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage the gentleman in a brief colloquy, regarding funding for the procurement technical assistance cooperative agreement program, also known as PTA. PTA, which provides matching funds for State and local procurement offices that assist small businesses in obtaining Federal contracts, is of great importance to my district, the State of Michigan, and the Northeast/Midwest region.

In my home State, a \$600,000 Federal contribution last year produced a State match of \$1.3 million. That assistance helped secure \$342 million in Federal contracts, which led to the creation of 2,063 new jobs and the retention of 1,227 jobs in Michigan. But Michigan is not the only State that has benefited from the PTA Program—indeed, many States have aided their small business sectors by participating in PTA. It is my understanding that this program has been fully authorized in this year's defense authorization bill.

Mr. ASPIN. That is right, I say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE]. PTA has been fully authorized, at \$9 million for fiscal year 1992 and 1993. You are also correct in saying that while PROTACA has been very successful in Michigan, it has been equally successful throughout the country. The \$10.6 million investment from the Federal Government in 1990 helped to fund a total of 87 procurement offices nationwide, an investment which will yield over \$1 billion in Federal contracts for small businesses, and will lead to the creation of tens of thousands of jobs.

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Chairman, as co-chairman of the Northeast/Midwest coalition, which is dedicated to preserving our region's industrial base, I would like to thank the Armed Services Committee and its chairman for including this program in next year's defense authorization bill.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS].

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. BYRON. I am glad to engage in a colloquy with my colleague, the gentleman from Kansas.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I thank the gentleman, and commend her efforts to adjust and refine military personnel programs in response to our experiences during Operation Desert Storm. The Persian Gulf Conflict Supplemental Authorization and Personnel Benefits Act of 1991 was a masterful piece of legislation that provided many valuable benefits to our troops in the field.

However, I am sure my colleague would agree that there are still many lessons to be learned from Operation Desert Storm, especially regarding military personnel policy and procedure as it relates to the family in a voluntary military. I submitted an amendment that focused on the "Human Lessons of Desert Storm." My amendment would have required the Secretary of Defense to examine its activation and deployment policies concerning single parents, dual military couples, and professionals whose activation would cause a severe hardship in their area, and report to Congress as to whether any policy changes should be made with regard to deploying or recruiting such personnel. More importantly, it required DOD to provide Congress with the rationale as to why the policies should be what they are. I believe it is essential that the Congress examine the many implications of the Desert Storm experience, evaluate a range of policy options, and work hand-

in-hand with the Department of Defense to create new policy.

I understand that the gentlewoman intends to conduct hearings on these important issues later this year, and I congratulate her leadership and foresight. I would like my colleague to know that I strongly endorse those hearings and would welcome the opportunity to participate.

Mrs. BYRON. I thank my colleague for her comments, and would confirm that her statement is absolutely correct. The key to our stunning victory in the gulf was the quality force that we recruited and retained over the last decade. Our ability to maintain that force will to a large degree depend on our ability to translate Desert Storm lessons into practical policies that enhance military readiness. The gentlewoman's plan for managing the Department's review of the people lessons of Desert Storm is a good one, and she can be sure that it will be a prominent part of the approach employed by the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation during hearings on the lessons learned this year. My colleague can be assured that her interest will be a welcome contribution to the hearings.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. I greatly appreciate the opportunity to discuss the gentlewoman's plans for addressing these critical issues, and will look forward to the hearings.

□ 1810

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. COX of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Maryland for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mrs. BYRON. I would be glad to enter into a colloquy with my colleague from New Mexico, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I would like to first commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Personnel and Compensation for the excellent work her subcommittee has done to implement a fair reduction plan for our National Guard and Reserve Forces. We all recognize that reductions to the Reserve Forces need to be made, but I had serious concerns about the manner in which the administration wished to proceed in that regard with its "Quicksilver" plan.

This is an area where action must be taken, but we must do so prudently to ensure that the National Guard can

maintain its role in Federal and State affairs, and to minimize the economic impact of these cuts. I am pleased that under this proposal the Army National Guard in New Mexico will have the flexibility to redistribute positions in order to keep armories open.

I am pleased the Armed Services Committee rejected the administration's proposed 107,526 force reduction and in its place offered a more sensible and fair approach for reducing Reserve personnel. I want to thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland, for working with me on this important issue and appreciate her willingness to address my objections to the "Quicksilver" plan.

Mrs. BYRON. I appreciate the kind remarks of my friend, the gentleman from New Mexico, and want to thank him for having taken an active interest in this matter. The gentleman is correct, the Armed Services Committee significantly modified the administration's request by reducing the fiscal year 1992 cut to Reserve Forces from 107,526—a 9 percent cut below fiscal year 1991 levels—to 37,580—a 3 percent cut below fiscal year 1991 levels. This plan corrects the administration's disproportionately large, front-loaded cuts in the Selected Reserve and sets the Reserve Forces on a smoother glide path that will protect many valuable units from the budgeteer's ax. I hope this slower paced force reduction will receive the full support of my colleagues.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend and colleague for her comments. I appreciate her leadership on this issue and would like to commend the committee members for fashioning a fair reduction to Reserve end strength.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding, and I would like to join in a colloquy with the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPRATT].

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will yield, I want to commend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] for his attempts to refine the maze of procurement ethics restrictions adopted over the years. I also want to raise an outstanding concern in this area which is of critical importance to the National Laboratory system operated by the Department of Energy.

Recent testimony before the Investigations Subcommittee highlighted the problem facing DOE labs and their ability to effectively utilize the skill and expertise of National Laboratory scientists within both the Department and the National Laboratories. It would be very unfortunate if the post-employment restrictions from previous

laws which are about to go into effect would permanently impair the ability of these highly skilled scientists to contribute to the operation of the lab system through Government service. I urge the gentleman to remain sensitive to this unique problem facing DOE and work to accommodate these concerns wherever possible as legislation proceeds.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for raising an excellent point. I agree with the gentleman that this is an important problem for DOE and the National Labs. It also happens to be a problem for other specialized agencies, such as NIH, the Bureau of Standards, and others. Accordingly, you can be assured that we will pay close attention to this question in any revision of procurement integrity or post-employment laws.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield further to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] and I will be joining in a colloquy.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take this time to discuss briefly the issue of minority business participation in Department of Defense contracts. It had been my hope that this matter would be debated on the House floor during consideration of the Defense authorization bill. In fact, I submitted to the House Rules Committee an amendment to section 1207 to require the Defense Department to award 5 percent of its contracts to minority-owned firms.

I know many of my colleagues share my concerns about minority business participation in Defense contracts and, in fact, all Government contracts. It is fair to say that we still have a long way to go before the Government achieves its stated policy goal of a minority business participation rate of 5 percent. I believe we will move closer to that participation rate by mandate rather than goal. By shifting the policy from a goal to mandate, the Federal Government will demonstrate its seriousness in promoting business opportunity for minority-owned firms that have the resources to do business with the Federal Government.

I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES] for his responsiveness on this issue and appreciate his willingness to see that it receives appropriate consideration under his chairmanship of the Armed Services Subcommittee on Investigations. Minority business participation in Government contracting plays a vital role in fostering entrepreneurialism for those in Amer-

ica who are unfairly denied other avenues of opportunity.

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my colleague from New Mexico and want to assure him that this issue will receive the full attention of my subcommittee. As the gentleman from New Mexico knows, I will be holding hearings in the Investigations Subcommittee in June on section 1207 and welcome his involvement on minority business participation in Defense contracts.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Massachusetts. As I indicated to him and others, my intention is not to hold up the Defense authorization bill. I thank him for his assurances that the issue of minority-owned firms doing business with the Government will be addressed fully and that we begin to do something in an area where results have been lacking.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for an additional 2 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MAVROULES].

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join in a colloquy with the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE].

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASPIN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MAVROULES], the chairman of the Investigations Subcommittee, for joining me in a colloquy.

If the gentleman will recall, at our request a study was called for through the conference report to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1991. This study, to be completed by the Department of Defense by this coming Friday, May 31, directs the DOD to study the creation of a mechanism to allow State and local law enforcement agencies to purchase small arms and other equipment by "piggybacking" onto DOD contracts, and their economies of scale.

This idea—originally section 832 of H.R. 4739, the House bill last year—was taken out in conference pending the outcome of this review and report. The DOD is to report to both the House Armed Services and Government Operations Committees on the idea's feasibility.

Mr. MAVROULES. Yes, the gentleman is correct. This study is due to be submitted to us on behalf of the Secretary of Defense by this coming Friday. The DOD was charged with determining if this idea is feasible and, if so, how it would be implemented. It was taken out in conference to allow fur-



ther time to study it to see if it was indeed possible and advisable.

Mr. WISE. Inasmuch as we are considering the fiscal year 1992-93 Defense Authorization Act this week and the study has not been submitted by the DOD as of yet, would it be the intent of the gentleman to follow up on the results of the study and implementation plan in separate legislation later in the year?

Mr. MAVROULES. Mr. Chairman, it would be my intent to revisit this issue at an appropriate time, not too distant in the future, to move to implement the program if it is determined to be feasible. The idea appears to have some merit, and we want to make sure that the DOD is giving it careful thought and study. I know that the GAO is monitoring the DOD's study, and I hope that I can report shortly to my friend from West Virginia that this idea is worth pursuing on the legislative front.

□ 1820

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Dickinson amendment in the form of a substitute to H.R. 2100. As we continue to reassess the role of the United States in the post-cold war era, it is critical that we continue to ensure its security. The President's Department of Defense budget as embodied in the Dickinson amendment clearly provides the best comprehensive strategy for meeting this challenge during these changing times.

The recent events in the Persian Gulf have had a significant effect on this year's debate on the Defense authorization bill and rightly so. The coordinated, massive attack by United States and allied forces dramatically influenced the outcome of the war. The facts are in, Mr. Chairman, and the military experts all agree, the war with Iraq was decided in the first few hours of engagement. Without a doubt, the decisive victory in the gulf demonstrated that preparedness enhanced by a superior technological base wins wars and saves lives.

The President's budget highlights the B-2 as a key component of our future force. Both Secretary Cheney and Gen. Colin Powell have testified to the significance of the B-2 in completing the later stages of stealth technology. In the gulf conflict, stealth fighters flew over 40 percent of the combat sorties during the first day of conflict even though it comprised only 5 percent of the total force. It is clear that stealth technology played a vital role in this conflict, and will continue to be critical in deterring future acts of aggression.

My only concern with the Dickinson amendment is the proposal to reshape Active and Reserve personnel. We have all acknowledged that the current world situation permits reductions in our military forces. I have continued to support this realignment, while recognizing that our troops must continue to be highly trained and responsive. For this reason, I have reservations with the administration's proposal for a 1:1 drawdown of Active Duty Forces compared to Guard and Reserve Forces. I firmly believe that this Nation's guardsmen and reservists were critical to the

success in the gulf conflict. For this reason, I believe that the committee recommendation of a 4:1 drawdown of Active personnel to Reserve personnel better serves the overall preparedness of our military, which ultimately is in the best interest of our national security.

My hope is that our Nation will never again be faced with a decision to go to war. Yet, if such circumstances arise that require us to send our men and women into battle, shouldn't we give them the best technology, the best equipment, and the best training our Nation can provide. In doing so we assure their safe return to their families. The programs supported in the President's defense budget provides the greatest assurance.

Mr. ASPIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. MAVROULES] the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON], and all the other members who have participated in the colloquys, and I yield the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SKAGGS] having assumed the chair, Mr. COX of Illinois, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2100) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 for military functions of the Department of Defense and to prescribe military personnel levels for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 I was unavoidably absent during regular House business.

Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on the following rollcall votes:

Rollcall No. 100.

Rollcall No. 101.

Rollcall No. 103.

PERMISSION TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2251, DIRE EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FROM CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS AND/OR INTEREST FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS IN AND AROUND IRAQ AS A RESULT OF THE RECENT INVASION OF KUWAIT AND FOR PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES AND OTHER URGENT NEEDS ACT OF 1991

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 2251) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for hu-

manitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

WAIVING ALL POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 121, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FISCAL YEAR 1991

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 102-70) on the resolution (H. Res. 157) waiving all points of order against the conference report on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 121) revising the Congressional Budget for the United States Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the Congressional Budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, and against the consideration of such conference report, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ACTIVITIES AND TRANSPORTATION OF COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS TO SIT TOMORROW, MAY 22, 1991, DURING 5-MINUTE RULE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Government Activities and Transportation of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to sit on May 22, 1991, while the House is proceeding under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. Speaker, the minority has agreed to this request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING THE PROFOUND REGRET OF CONGRESS REGARDING ASSASSINATION OF RAJIV GANDHI OF INDIA

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 155) expressing the profound regret of the Congress regarding the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi of India.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I do so to afford the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs an opportunity to explain this resolution, and I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great sense of regret that I have asked unanimous consent to call up this resolution. I truly wish that there had been no need to do so, but a little bit earlier today we received the news that Rajiv Gandhi, the leader of the Congress (I) Party and the former Prime Minister of India had been brutally killed in a bomb explosion which took place as he was emerging from a car in his campaign cavalcade 25 miles south of Madras.

Rajiv Gandhi, Mr. Speaker, was a friend of mine. I met with him on many occasions, both here in the United States and in India itself. He was a good man. He was a decent man. But above all, Mr. Speaker, he was a courageous man. He knew that following the tragic assassination several years ago of his mother, who was then serving as Prime Minister of India, that he was probably a marked man, and by virtue of his commitment to public service he enormously increased his personal vulnerability to those who were determined to do him in. Yet his commitment to democracy, his commitment to the welfare and well-being of his people, led him to make the decision that, instead of enjoying the life of leisure and perhaps even luxury which could have been his, he should devote his days and his energies and his life to the welfare and well-being of his own people.

The bomb that went off in South India earlier today was a bomb intended to explode democracy in India itself. It is entirely possible that this dastardly deed may have brought the leading political dynasty in South Asia to an end, but I have every confidence that it will not bring the cause of democracy in India to an end.

Over the course of the last four decades, democracy has sunk deep and, hopefully, enduring roots in the soil of India. It is now by far the most populous democracy in the world, and the people of that country are determined to preserve their opportunity to determine their own destiny.

Leaders come and go, but systems of government endure.

What I think, Mr. Speaker, makes this assassination a particularly dastardly deed, indeed a desecration of democracy, is the fact that it came right in the middle of the current election campaign in India, while—unlike our country where people vote on one day alone—people vote on three different days staggered over a period of about 1 week. The first day of balloting had already taken place. The next day of bal-

loting is only 2 days from now. The last day of balloting will be 3 days later. And in the midst of the actual election itself, as Rajiv Gandhi was carrying his message to the people of India, his assassins struck him down.

So this resolution expresses the condolences of the House to Mr. Gandhi's family and to the people of India itself who have suffered grievously as a consequence of this brutal murder.

□ 1830

After Rajiv Gandhi's mother was killed several years ago, there was a tragic round of communal rioting in which thousands of Indians lost their lives. I very much hope, Mr. Speaker, that the death of her son will not produce the same kind of backlash or response once again.

I trust that the Government, determined to prevent such outrages, will take whatever steps may be necessary to prevent them from taking place.

So I very much hope that the House will adopt this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, a little bit earlier today, in what I think may well have been an unprecedented gesture, we rose in a minute of silence called for by the very distinguished minority whip of the House, in what I thought was a very moving and deeply appropriate gesture. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the adoption of this resolution as well will be a reminder to the people of India that we here in the United States, the world's most powerful democracy, have a very special sense of kinship and affection for those in the world's most populous democracy.

During the course of his years as Prime Minister, the relationship between India and the United States flourished. We did not always agree with Rajiv Gandhi's policies or positions, but he was very much committed to an improvement in Indo-American relations, and in fact they did improve during his years in office.

Today the current state of our relationship is in no small measure due to his efforts to strengthen the ties between New Delhi and Washington.

So we say goodbye to a friend, we say goodbye to a great political leader, and we say goodbye to a man who shared our own deep commitment to the fundamental and enduring principle that all men and women, wherever they may be, have the right and the capacity to determine their own destiny through the establishment of truly democratic systems of government.

Rajiv Gandhi is not the first martyr to the cause of democracy; he will surely not be the last. But let his life and his legacy be an inspiration to all those who share his deep commitment to the cause of democratic government.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I want to join

the gentleman from New York in expressing great sadness that we learned of the assassination of former Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi. It is a tragedy for the Gandhi family—which has suffered twice at the hands of assassins in the last 7 years—a tragedy for the people of India, and a tragedy for all of us who believe in democratic process.

The history of democratic, independent India, and the Nehru-Gandhi family has been closely intertwined for the past half century. Rajiv Gandhi followed in the great tradition of leadership and service to his country that had been established by his grandfather and his mother, Indira Gandhi. He served as India's Prime Minister from 1984-89 with distinction. He was seeking the opportunity again to serve in that capacity when he was killed today. Rajiv Gandhi was a brave and exceptional public servant, and his loss will truly be felt.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of this resolution expressing the Congress' profound regret on the assassination, and offering our sympathy to the people of India, and to the Gandhi family.

I also wish to thank my friend Chairman FASCELL of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Congressman SOLARZ and Congressman LEACH, the chairman and the ranking Republican of the Asia Subcommittee for bringing this resolution before us in a timely manner. We in this country have experienced assassinations and know that the road to democracy is not necessarily smooth and straight. As we have, I know that India's democracy will pass through this time of trial and continue to flourish despite this great tragedy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from California [Mrs. BOXER].

Mrs. BOXER. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I want the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] to know that they speak for the whole House.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation of objection, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, along with the ranking member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] for bringing the resolution to the floor at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the Solarz Rajiv Gandhi memorial resolution and to express my outrage, shock and horror with regard to today's tragic assassination of the former prime minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi.



This wanton act of terrorism took place at an election rally as Rajiv Gandhi was attempting a political comeback. It is even more tragic to note that the former prime minister was one of some 185 innocent Indians who were killed in election-related violence since the polls opened this past Monday.

Mr. Speaker, ironically, Rajiv Gandhi had no desire to follow in the footsteps of his sainted grandfather, Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, or his mother, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. His interest in public service came about only after appeals from his mother and his party in the wake of the 1981 death of his brother, Sanjay, in a plane crash.

Although Sanjay was being groomed for eventual leadership, it was Rajiv Gandhi who was able to rally his nation in the wake of his own mother's assassination. He will always be remembered as the personification of the individual called to service by events out of his control, and it is doubly tragic that he was lost in this manner.

Rajiv Gandhi is survived by his Italian-born wife, Sonia, a son and a daughter. The world shares their loss, for a brutal assassination such as this has no place in the annals of decency.

The Indian people—in fact, the cause of democracy throughout the entire world—has sustained a stunning loss with the death of Rajiv Gandhi.

We all hope and pray that this tragedy will not encourage further bloodshed and will not weaken or erode the long, strong tradition of democratic government in India.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the Solarz amendment.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. DYMALLY], chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. DYMALLY. I thank my good friend from Michigan for yielding to me to join with my colleagues and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] in expressing my deep sympathy to his family and the people of India. Mr. Speaker, It was my good fortune to be in India the day Mr. Gandhi was sworn into the House in the Indian Parliament.

The night before, he was cohost of a reception for me. Out of those two meetings, I got to know him very well.

Of all the people I have met in my travels, certainly not as much as my friend from New York, Mr. SOLARZ, no one impressed me as much with his humility, his modesty, his attentiveness to the words you spoke to him and his gentle manner.

Mr. Speaker, he was a gentleman, very soft spoken, very cultured, a very polite man.

I just want to cite one personal experience with him to illustrate the sort

of person he was, one who gave personal attention to issues on which he felt very strongly.

He chaired the African Fund, which came out of the nonaligned movement. And a friend of mine, the chairman of the Committee for Free Africa, was raising money for the children of southern Africa and wanted to meet Mr. Gandhi.

□ 1840

He was in southern France, my friend is from Los Angeles. He was visiting southern France. I sent a fax message to Mr. Gandhi. He got the Indian Embassy in France to locate this gentleman and had him flown to New Delhi, met with him to discuss his interest in Africa's children. And when he came to Washington, again, he followed that up, that interest up with another meeting. It was the kind of personal attention he gave to people for whom he cared so very much.

It is a tragic loss, not only for India but for democracy and for people around the world.

As Mr. SOLARZ has stated, from time to time we have differences with India, but these things are natural. We have differences with our best friends. But he brought us closer together. His historic appearance in this House left everyone with a very good feeling about the future relationship between the United States and India and the future of India, indeed.

It is indeed sad that a man who believed so much in nonviolence was taken away by violence. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this tragic loss which India has just suffered would at least give pause for reflection and the people of India would begin to recognize that they have to begin to reconcile their differences through the ballot box and not through the bullet.

I hope that his loss will be a signal for a new democracy, a new reconciliation in India.

I join with my colleagues in expressing my deep sympathy to his family and the people of India.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH], the vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs.

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. I would also like to thank the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, as well as the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL] and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for moving this very appropriate resolution honoring the life and expressing outrage at the death of one of the greatest democratic leaders of the world, Rajiv Gandhi.

No one in the United States or around the world can be anything but appalled, shocked, and deeply saddened by the brutal assassination of Rajiv Gandhi. In one sense, the murder of the former Prime Minister is not only a blow to an individual and his great country, it is also an attack on the rich fabric of democracy itself, an attack I am confident the people and institutions of India can overcome. But in a larger sense, Gandhi's assassination is a graphic reminder to all of us that even as we celebrate the new paradigm shift in international relations toward the classically liberal vision of a peaceful world order based upon free peoples, free markets, and collective security, other darker, more malignant forces are at work in the world threatening the fragmentation of the new world order and with it the vitality and health of the great liberal democracies.

Assassins must understand that attempting to influence events through terrorism does not simply rub out human life; it stabs society's soul.

In a philosophical context, the senseless act of violence is a blasphemous repudiation of the timeless teachings of Mahatma Gandhi. He coined the term Satyagraha, meaning vindication of truth, not by inflicting suffering on others but through nonviolent and patient self-suffering. I can think of no more profound message for India and the world today than to reflect upon Gandhi's message that nonviolence and truth—Satya—are inseparable and presuppose one another.

Rajiv Gandhi was thrust into politics by two family tragedies: The death of his younger brother, Sanjay, in 1980 and the assassination of his mother, Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, in 1984.

Grandson of India's first Prime Minister and in a very real sense the founder of the modern Indian state, Jawaharlal Nehru, Rajiv Gandhi was nevertheless unafraid to challenge one of the pillars of the tripartite Nehruvian consensus: secularism, socialism, and democracy. Rajiv Gandhi sought to move India in a more free market direction, to ease the anti-competitive shackles of Fabian socialism. He also sought to improve United States-Indian ties, which warmed so noticeably in early 1989 after the inauguration of President Bush, who considered Rajiv Gandhi a close personal friend.

Rajiv Gandhi may have been a reluctant politician but he was a national leader with a sure, intuitive sense of his country. His assassins and all those who would threaten Indian democracy today would do well to heed his words. As he said in an interview in 1985:

What Nehru and the founding fathers gave us has stood the test of time, the test of tremendous tensions. Democracy has reached deep into the average Indian. I don't think anybody could change the system today. I think we got it right at the very beginning.

As a Representative of the American Congress, we pray that the world's largest democracy sustains its remarkable heritage of strength and at a personal level we would like through this resolution to express our deepest sympathy to the people of India, to the Gandhi family and to the family members of the others who were killed today in this despicable act of terrorism.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under my reservation, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER].

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding to me. I thank and congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for authorizing this very important resolution.

It is very tragic that we have to address a situation like this, but I would like to join in extending my sympathies to family members and to not only all the people of India but to the people throughout the world who are rapidly gaining a great new appreciation for democracy. It is clear that the Gandhi family has symbolized the struggle for democracy. And as has been pointed out by my colleagues here, India, as the largest democracy on the face of the Earth, is one which has been a model for many struggling countries.

I will never forget the address delivered in this Chamber by Rajiv Gandhi. I, like all of my colleagues, was moved by his compassion and his concern, not only for the people of India but for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

When one thinks of the challenges which lie ahead, the despicable act that we have witnessed today is one which will be a setback, but I hope very much that it will redouble the efforts of the people of India and people throughout the world who are struggling on behalf of what it is that Rajiv Gandhi loved and wanted to perpetuate. That is freedom and democracy.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLARZ].

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] for yielding.

I simply wanted to say, in conclusion, that I am particularly grateful to the distinguished ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and the very distinguished ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Asian and Pacific Affairs, Mr. LEACH, as well as to the leadership on both sides of the aisle for making it possible for us to bring this resolution before the House on what was obviously very short notice. I think it represents a recognition on their part of the fact that such a tribute is only fitting to a fallen leader

in a great democracy who was a friend of the United States.

It is also a tribute to their sense of statesmanship that they were prepared to accommodate this resolution.

I would also simply like to take note of the fact that a dispatch I have before me, which has recently come in on the wire services, indicates that security forces in India were put on alert nationwide and that police in the capital were rushed to sensitive areas in an effort to prevent the kind of rioting that followed the October 30, 1984, assassination of Rajiv Gandhi's mother, Indira Gandhi, who had been Prime Minister at the time she was assassinated. I want to call this to the attention of the House because I think it indicates that the Government of India is apparently taking steps to prevent any subsequent outrages from taking place. I think at a moment of great grief and anxiety, they certainly deserve credit for taking those steps, and hopefully they will succeed in preventing any additional bloodletting as a consequence of this tragic assassination.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 155, expressing the profound regret of the Congress at the assassination of former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India. The resolution rightly points out the support of the Congress for the democratic process in India, and its condemnation of this cowardly act. The United States has had a long friendship with the people of the world's largest democracy, and I am sure we all share in the grief the Indian people feel at this tragic loss. The United States will continue its support for the forces of democratic change in India, which are stronger than any terrorist group, and will continue to oppose these acts of terrorism wherever they may arise.

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my name to the list of my colleagues who have expressed their sadness over the recent assassination of Rajiv Gandhi. I express my sincere condolences to his family, his wife Sonia, and their two children.

Mr. Speaker, Rajiv Gandhi was truly a great man. He possessed an unyielding commitment to democracy that will truly be missed. A man born into the upper caste of Indian society and his family's place in Indian history secure, Mr. Gandhi could have easily led a life of leisure. Instead, after the deaths of both his mother and brother he selflessly entered public life at what many believed to be great personal danger.

Serving as Prime Minister of India from 1984–1989, Mr. Gandhi had already ministered to his country with distinction. However, he was a man dedicated to his cause. He had launched himself back into the battle of furthering democracy in India and was in the process of regaining his former position when he was senselessly and brutally assassinated.

This loss deals a severe blow to the forces of democracy in India. However, Mr. Speaker, I know that democracy in India will survive. The tireless work of people such as Mr. Gandhi and his family have imbedded the roots of

democracy in India and they will continue to grow. I hope that this event serves to spur the efforts of democracy forward. There would be no more fitting memorial to Mr. Gandhi than that of lasting peace and democracy in India.

I never had the honor of meeting Mr. Gandhi. Many of my colleagues worked closely with him and they all speak of his honor and courage in the face of constant danger to his life. He was a great man who made the highest sacrifice to his cause. I stand with my colleagues and mourn his tragic death.

Mr. BOOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. SKAGGS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 155

Whereas the former Prime Minister of India, Rajiv Gandhi, was assassinated in a bomb attack at a May 21 election rally in the southern Indian town of Sriperumbudur;

Whereas more than 10 other people were reportedly killed in the incident;

Whereas the attack has occurred while the Indian people are participating in national elections,

Whereas these elections reflect a long tradition of democratic government in India, which has conducted free and fair elections periodically since independence in 1947;

Whereas former Prime Minister Gandhi was a friend of the United States, as well as a strong proponent and an effective spokesman on behalf of Indian democracy;

Whereas the former Prime Minister demonstrated compassion to his fellow man and devotion to the service of others; and

Whereas during Rajiv Gandhi's tenure as Prime Minister, relations between the United States and India flourished: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—*

(1) expresses its profound regret on the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi and the deaths of others in the bombing attack in the town of Sriperumbudur;

(2) offers its sympathy to the people of India, to the Gandhi family, and to the family members of others who were killed;

(3) reaffirms its support for the democratic process in India;

(4) strongly condemns this wanton act of terrorism; and

(5) expresses its confidence that this tragedy will not undermine the strength and vibrancy of Indian democracy.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1850

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on House Concurrent Resolution 155, the concurrent resolution just adopted.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### IN SUPPORT OF THE CHENEY BUDGET AND MICHEL SUBSTITUTE

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous material.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, in approximately 1 hour we will have an opportunity to make a very significant choice. We can either choose to adopt the defense authorization as proposed by the President of the United States through his Secretary of Defense, Dick Cheney, or we can adopt the committee bill from the Armed Services Committee. Our choice is really fundamental, because it boils down to whether or not we trust the people who successfully planned the war against Iraq, or do we trust the people who cobbled together the bill in the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. Speaker, the Michel substitute which will present the Cheney defense budget is the bill that we should be supporting, because it includes an overall strategy of how our defense should be put together and it funds it all within the appropriations cap under which we are operating this year.

The bill that came out of the Armed Services Committee, on the other hand, coincidentally makes some provision for defense, but does so only coincidentally; it is too much a composition of special interests cobbled together by the members of the committee.

We have a very clear choice. I urge my colleagues to support the Michel substitute.

I include the following article from the Wall Street Journal of May 21:

##### GENERAL ASPIN'S PORK ARMY

The man who planned America's air campaign against Iraq, Lt. Gen. Charles Horner, says the war taught him two main lessons—the importance of stealth technology, and the need to defend against ballistic missiles, such as Scuds. So guess what the U.S. House of Representatives is trying to gut in this year's defense budget? Stealth and missile defenses.

We'd have thought the Gulf War also taught that the world remains a dangerous place, even with a declining Soviet threat; that high-tech weapons are an important American strategic advantage; that the Pentagon's war-fighting strategy has some basis in reality after all. But the House is acting as if nothing much happened in Iraq, as if Scuds never flew and all future threats have vanished. For all the rethinking in Congress, the Pentagon might as well have lost the war.

This is no mere caricature; the Members are only too happy to say it themselves. "The Persian Gulf War hasn't really entered into this year's debate over the fate of major weapons," says Ron Dellums, the Berkeley

Democrat. Adds Republican William Dickinson of Alabama: "Desert Storm is behind us, and the defense drawdown train has left the station."

The four-star general driving this train is Les Aspin, chairman of the traveling circus known as the House Armed Services Committee. General Aspin knows that defense spending in the House is less about war than about ideology and pork-barrel politics. The chairman has one staff member, Larry Smith, devoted mainly to the task of "Member services." His job is to keep the chairman informed of the Members' wish lists, which Mr. Aspin then dutifully tries to meet to keep his troops happy. This year Mr. Smith has been working overtime.

Ron Dellums, for example, has long been on a crusade against the B-2 Stealth bomber, and General Aspin now agrees. He rallied his committee to slash B-2 spending by two-thirds to \$1.6 billion and a future total of only 15 bombers, though the Pentagon wants 75. Mr. Aspin apparently isn't impressed that the Stealth fighter, the F-117, flew just about every sensitive mission over Baghdad without a single loss.

The B-2 is more expensive than it should have been, but most of its research costs are already paid for. It's a stealthy craft that can carry a huge payload as far as 10,000 miles on a single refueling—but projecting U.S. power is not a House priority.

Nor it would seem is anti-missile defense. General Aspin's committee slashed the Pentagon's SDI request to \$2.7 billion (from \$4.5 billion) and refused any money for space-based interceptors known as Brilliant Pebbles. General Aspin claims to still support "theater" defenses such as the Patriot, but as Scuds proliferate and grow more sophisticated, defenses must do the same. A defense based in space can protect against missiles launched from anywhere, while a "theater" defense is by definition confined to a specific location.

Stealing from SDI and the B-2 means General Aspin has more money to buy his committee's votes. Mississippi Democrat Sonny Montgomery grabbed more than \$1 billion for the reserves, including \$280 million for National Guard armories (in some 100 congressional districts) that the Pentagon doesn't want. The Pentagon has to deactivate four army divisions through 1993, but the reserves supposedly assigned to those divisions will live on. Behold the reserves' new Lost Brigades.

The Ohio and Michigan delegations won \$270 million for 60 more M-1 tanks, as if tank battles are the wave of the future. Pennsylvania Republican Curt Weldon happily sold his vote for more money for the V-22 Osprey, which the Pentagon has tried to kill for three straight years.

Some Members go especially cheap. Richard Ray, a Georgia Democrat, backed Mr. Aspin after he squeezed projects worth \$4.2 million for Robins Air Force Base in his district. Virginia Democrat Norman Sisisky went along with the chairman after Fort Lee, in his Virginia district, lined up for \$11.3 million for a finance office and training facility the Pentagon didn't want. "I could give you hundreds of these examples," says one Pentagon source.

Some log-rolling is inevitable, but a fast-declining defense budget has a smaller margin for waste. Defense Secretary Cheney's budget already proposes to shrink the military by 25% through 1995, to the lowest level as a share of the economy since 1939. Anything less and the U.S. might not be able to repeat Desert Storm, which apparently

doesn't worry the pork-barrel generals of Congress.

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION, A BIPARTISAN BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I take out this special order this evening to comment on the debate earlier today on H.R. 2100, the defense authorization bill for next fiscal year, as well as to respond in part to an editorial today in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. Speaker, if one were to listen to the tone of debate on the floor of the House, which ended up being quite partisan, as well as the comments in the Wall Street Journal today, one would think that the defense bill that the Committee on Armed Services reported out today was totally a partisan bill and that one was only concerned with the parochial interests of Members of the majority party.

Mr. Speaker, as we all know, the vote on H.R. 2100, despite intense lobbying by the administration and the Department of Defense, only passed this House by a vote of 287 to 127, but also included the votes of 37 Republican Members of this institution. My feeling is that if the lobbying had not been so intense by the White House and by the Department of Defense, that there would have been a number of Members on this side who would have joined with the 37 Members who supported this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I take great pride in not being a fair weather friend at the Defense Establishment, of being someone who believes that we need to have a strong military in order to be prepared to deal with situations like we just went through in Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, I also am one to believe that the Committee on Armed Services this year was put into an impossible situation. The defense numbers that we were given through the bipartisan summit agreement reached last fall, which I disagreed with and voted against, are totally unrealistic and, in my opinion, unacceptable.

If you compare defense spending as a percentage of our gross national product, this budget agreement drops us down to 3.6 percent of the end of this 5-year budget period, compared to in excess of 8 percent of our GNP being spent on defense back in the late 1950's and the early 1960's.

If you compare defense spending as a percentage of our total Federal outlays, at the end of this 5-year budget agreement we will be spending about 18 percent of our Federal outlays on defense, as compared to over 50 percent of our Federal outlays that were spent on defense back in the 1950's and 1960's.

This Committee on Armed Services then had to take an unworkable number and, based upon the ideas and concerns of the military that were given to us through in excess of 100 individual hearings, markup sessions, and deliberations of the Committee on Armed Services, come up with a package that we felt best met the needs of our military into the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, this was not a partisan effort. The vote in the Procurement Subcommittee, which contained the bulk of the issues that were under discussion today in the defense bill, related to the B-2 bomber and the SDI. In the Procurement Subcommittee the vote was 15 to 4 to eliminate the B-2 funding. It was not a partisan vote. It was a vote that had Republicans and Democrats joined together. As a matter of fact, there were only two Republicans in the Procurement Subcommittee who supported the B-2 bomber.

In the full committee, when the final defense bill was marked up, H.R. 2100, to come to the floor, it was once again not a partisan vote. In fact, the vote was 45 in favor of the committee bill and 6 opposed. As a matter of fact, 10 of my Republican colleagues changed their vote from the time the bill left the committee until the time the bill reached the floor today and we voted on the Michel substitute.

Mr. Speaker, this in fact was a bipartisan effort. These hearings that we held throughout the last several months allowed us to come up with what we think is a workable defense plan, based upon an impossible budget number that we were provided. Therefore, those that charge that we changed Secretary Cheney's request, in fact, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] stated on the floor today, we gave the Secretary approximately 95 percent of what he asked for. Specifically, we only changed 14 percent of the total line items that Congress has oversight on. On the procurement section, only 6 percent. In the total perspective, about 95 percent of what the President and the Secretary of Defense asked for, the committee gave to them.

Mr. Speaker, when we finally get to conference, my prediction is that number will rise to almost 98 percent. So we in fact did give the Secretary of Defense the bulk of what he asked for.

Mr. Speaker, some would say Congress does not have a role, that we should not be involved in second-guessing the administration and the Defense Department. In fact, I would say that we have done that repeatedly.

I am reminded of an issue back in the late 1970's where the administration for 3 consecutive years attempted to eliminate a new technology, an aircraft that was supposed to provide close air support for our marines and Special Forces, and in fact was the No. 1 priority of the Marine Corps.

Mr. Speaker, for 3 straight years the administration opposed the program, and for 3 straight years Congress put the program back in the budget. In fact, the program was finally funded to the full extent, and the AV-8B Harrier jet was one of the most successful aircraft that we saw operational in Desert Storm. So there is in fact a role for the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would say that we in the committee did listen to the generals. We listened to General Gray, General Steiner, General Pittman last year, and Admiral Dunn, and took their priorities, the priorities of those commandants on the front battle lines, and we met their needs. The budget we brought up in H.R. 2100 I think does that and is a workable plan.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have supported it, and I look forward to working in conference to come even closer to the wishes of the Secretary of Defense.

#### MFN STATUS FOR CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, last week, President Bush announced his support for renewing most-favored-nation trade status to the People's Republic of China. I rise today to urge my colleagues to encourage the President to reconsider MFN status with China. While I support the principle of free trade and close diplomatic and trade relations with China, it is time we used our trade discussions to send a message that MFN status will only be continued if tangible progress is made by the Chinese Government on several fronts. The President has until June 3, 1991, to determine whether China's MFN status should be renewed.

Most-favored-nation trade status with the United States is a privilege we bestow on nations that abide by accepted standards of conduct in the international political arena. Among those standards are respect for human rights, for a free and open press, for due judicial process, for the sovereignty and borders of other nations, for nonrestrictive trade policy, and for observance of binding arms control and nuclear technology proliferation agreements.

China has refused to abide by these standards. China's human rights abuses, its reported proliferation of nuclear weapons and technology, and its violation of international law by continuing to occupy Tibet, simply cannot be ignored by the President or by Congress. China's behavior is undeserving of MFN status with our country.

Despite the international outcry following the brutal suppression of the prodemocracy demonstrators in Tiananmen Square in June 1989, the Chinese Government refuses to improve its human rights record. I have received constant reports of widespread religious persecution, torture, inhumane prison conditions, restricted press and assembly, and long-term imprisonment without charge or trial. I urge

President Bush to denounce these human rights abuses when considering the renewal of China's MFN status.

Reports of China's proliferation of nuclear weapons technology are equally distressing. My colleagues will certainly agree that one of the lessons of the gulf war is that the world community cannot allow the wrong weapons, technology, and capabilities to get into the wrong hands. Saddam Hussein would have posed no threat to world peace if he had not been armed by unscrupulous arms dealers. Now, there are reports that China has actively engaged in providing Pakistan, Algeria, Argentina, and Brazil with nuclear capability. By using our MFN trade leverage to discourage China's nuclear capability trade, the President can show his commitment to arms control.

China's occupation of Tibet is yet another example of its contempt for international law. The time has come for us to condemn this attack on Tibet's sovereignty, which has lasted for 40 years and is not recognized by the United States, and MFN trade negotiations are an appropriate avenue for conveying our steadfast commitment to restoring Tibet's independence. I urge the President to do so.

Mr. Speaker, the President has an opportunity to improve China's unacceptable record of human rights abuses, of nuclear technology proliferation, and to challenge the occupation of Tibet. I urge him to condemn China's affronts to the international community by reconsidering the renewal of its MFN trade status with our country.

#### SAUDI INATTENTION AND INACTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the story I have to tell starts over 10 years ago with the failure of an American company, occasioned by the nonpayment of debts owed it by the Government of Saudi Arabia. The debts were for services performed, and I will include details in the RECORD following these remarks. But I particularly stand in this well today to recount the treatment that this Member of Congress and others have received when he and they inquired or attempted to inquire on behalf of 12 creditor banks, their shareholders, and depositors in the United States, some of whom are Missourians.

Indeed, the Internal Revenue Service has an interest in this matter, and so through it do all taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote letters to the Saudi Ambassador on October 2, October 29, and November 19, 1990, and heard nothing. Letters have been sent by numerous other Members of Congress and U.S. Senators for the same purpose, and with the same result.

A letter signed by 24 Members of Congress and United States Senators was sent to the Saudi Ambassador on January 5, 1991. To date, we have not received an acknowledgment of that letter.



□ 1900

Additionally, longstanding friends of Saudi Arabia wrote to the Embassy with an offer of their counsel on this issue.

On February 20, 1991, I received acknowledgment of my letters of October 29, 1990 and November 2, 1990. In that letter the Ambassador stated that my office would be contacted to schedule a meeting in the near future.

I heard nothing further from the Ambassador or from the Saudi Arabian Embassy.

On March 26, 1991, a member of my staff talked with the Saudis' American consultant, Mr. Dutton. Mr. Dutton asked my staff member to meet with a representative of the Saudi Embassy as a precursor to my meeting with the Ambassador. My staff person agreed, and a meeting was set for a date in April.

In the meantime, I was informed by sources with connections to the Saudi Embassy that there was an effort to stall any meeting with me prior to the end of April. I discounted this information as rumor because of Mr. Dutton's involvement with my office.

Much to my disappointment, my staff person was kept waiting for nearly 2 hours at the Saudi Embassy in April. The representative of the Saudi Embassy never met with my staff person, and I have heard nothing further from the Ambassador or staff at the Embassy.

Needless to say, I am outraged over the inexcusable actions of the Saudi Arabian Embassy in handling this issue, and the affront to this Member and a number of colleagues that this inaction represents. Stonewalling, I think, is the term to use in describing the treatment we have received.

It appears that there is a growing pattern of behavior on the Saudis' part with reference to their debts in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I include a background statement regarding claims of Sanderson and Porter for contract settlement in this matter.

The document referred to follows:

#### BACKGROUND STATEMENT REGARDING CLAIMS OF SANDERSON & PORTER FOR CONTRACT SETTLEMENT

A Special Audit Committee appointed by the United States District Court in Washington, DC along with the Internal Revenue Service represents the United States Government's noncongressional interest in the matter of Sanderson & Porter.<sup>1</sup> Sanderson & Porter ("S&P"), a New Jersey company, from the 19th century had been one of the most prestigious and effective contributors to

United States engineering capability both domestically and internationally. In the 1970's it staked its reputation and ultimately its existence on its faith in the Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia's willingness and ability to meet its contractual obligations.

S&P has been owed money for its work on three projects for the Saline Water Conversion Corporation ("SWCC"), an agency of the Government of Saudi Arabia for over a decade. These projects—Al Jobail Phase I, Al Jobail Phase II and Al Khafji Phase II—were originally part of Saudi Arabia's efforts in the 1970's to vastly increase the capacity of its desalination plants to support the country's increasing population and industrial development. In fact, these plants in the Eastern Province presently are providing both water and power to all the international peacekeeping forces (including the United States Army, Navy, Marines, and Air Force) now in Saudi Arabia. The three plants were expected to provide a total of 210 million Imperial gallons per day of salt-free water as well as 2,150,000 kilowatts of power. The three projects were expected to cost SR 368,493,300 for design and engineering, and over 20 billion rials in construction costs.

S&P's formal involvement with the projects began in December 1974 with the signing of the contract for Al Jobail I. Its participation greatly expanded in the following years with the signing of the contract for the small Al Khafji plant in March 1975 and the much larger Al Jobail Phase II facility in February 1976.

Work progressed on all three projects until September 1978, when SWCC failed to pay S&P and announced that the Al Jobail Phase II project was to be withdrawn from S&P and another engineering firm hired for political reasons. SWCC followed suit by promptly terminating S&P's responsibilities on Al Khafji and on Al Jobail Phase I but with promises that full cooperation in the transition would result in full payment to S&P for work done. Although S&P fully performed its responsibilities in transferring control of the projects, no payment was forthcoming.

In 1979 and 1980, S&P submitted preliminary documentation of money owed on two of the projects through the American Embassy in and pursuant to SWCC procedure and requests. S&P was told it would be paid once the projects had been finally tested. Shortly thereafter, as a result of a severe cash flow problem caused by SWCC's failure to pay, S&P found itself in a financial condition that prevented the company from pursuing its claims. Indeed, as the direct result of the withdrawal of the Saudi projects, the company was unable to continue its operations, and in April 1980 its non-Saudi Arabian assets and contracts were sold to another engineering firm.

Last year S&P, with the support of its creditors, including the United States Government and this nation's leading banks (see footnote #1), prepared and submitted documentation in support of the Company's claim.<sup>2</sup> At that time, both the Al Jobail Phase I and Phase II facilities were operating, producing substantial amounts of desalinated water and electrical power for Saudi Arabia [and as of August 1990 for the peacekeeping forces], SWCC should have fulfilled its responsibility to reimburse S&P for

its considerable contribution to the start-up and ultimate success of the projects.

S&P and its co-claimant ("DPA") are currently owed SR 325,000,000 for their work on the projects.

#### CONGRATULATING WINNERS OF THE 1990-91 YOUNG WRITER'S CONTEST

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GLICKMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the Congress are concerned with the serious educational challenges that confront our country. As a former school board president, I struggled daily with the needs for quality education, and I learned to understand and respect the efforts of educators not only in my home district and State, but in the Nation as a whole. Those who make a difference benefit us all.

In that respect, I am very pleased to bring to your attention the Young Writer's Contest Foundation and its annual nationwide competition for first through 8th graders. I point with pride to two youngsters from my district, Lindsay Weillert, Blessed Sacrament School and Chris Rupe, Robinson Middle School, both from Wichita, who were two of the 100 winners of this year's Young Writer's contest. I also congratulate Anna Van Cleave, Holy Trinity School, of Lenexa in the Third District of Kansas, who won similar honors.

Chosen from 18,000 submissions, Lindsay's poem and Chris' essay will be published, thanks to the generous sponsorship of Ronald McDonald Children's Charities, in the 1991 Rainbow Collection: Stories and Poetry by Young People, and reprinted in America on My Mind, Falcon Press, September 1991.

The Young Writer's contest is a small organization that does a big job. It was formed in 1984 for the purpose of improving the basic communication skills of young people in the United States. During the 7 years since, two staff members have coordinated the valuation of 60,000 entries and the publication and distribution of 123,000 copies of its anthology of winning entries. The Young Writer's contest is a shining example of how individuals can—through hard work, tenacity, and sheer determination—create an activity of substance, and one that illustrates the positive accomplishments of students and educators.

Please join me in congratulating Lindsay Weillert and Chris Rupe, as well as the other 98 winners of the 1990-91 Young Writer's contest. They are:

City, State, School, Student name, and WNR/Age:

Anchorage, AK, Rogers Park, Gail Burger, W-11.

Huntsville, AL, Academy for Science & Foreign, Allison Ivey, W-9.

Alpena, AR, Alpena Public School, Tory Hodges, W-6.

Glendale, AZ, Barcelona Elementary School, Melanie Kuntz, W-12.

Burlingame, CA, Burlingame Intermediate, Karen Paik, W-13.

Chula Vista, CA, Bonita Vista Junior High School, John Niekrasz, W-13.

Hillsborough, CA, Nueva Center for Learning, David Susman, W-10.

<sup>1</sup>Other creditors claiming through S&P are Chemical Bank, Mellon Bank, N.A., European American Bank & Trust Company, Security Pacific National Bank, Credit Lyonnais, Mercantile Trust Company, N.A., Banco Real, S.A., Fort Worth National Bank, Mercantile National Bank (Dallas), Northwestern National Bank, Bank of Montreal (California), Center Bank of Kansas City, N.A. and Design and Programming & Associates, a Saudi Arabian Company.

<sup>2</sup>This documentation is a 75-page brief and 11 volumes of exhibits. All documents are available for review at the offices of Sharp & Lankford, 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20036 (phone 202-745-1700).

Irvine, CA, Meadow Park School, Devon Nunes, W-11.  
 Irvine, CA, Santiago Hills Elementary, Rachell Lev, W-10.  
 Walnut Creek, CA, Dorris-Eaton School, Carie Yonekawa, W-8.  
 Westlake Village, CA, Westlake Hills Elementary, Sarah Joseph, W-10.  
 Denver, CO, The Forest Lyceum, Lily Adam, W-8.  
 Pomfret Center, CT, Pomfret Community School, Erica Sweet, W-10.  
 West Hartford, CT, Wolcott Elementary School, Margot Simpson, W-9.  
 Greenwood, DE, Woodbridge Elementary, Sarah Passwaters, W-10.  
 Longwood, FL, Rock Lake Middle School, Erin Butler, W-13.  
 Miami, FL, Ransom-Everglades Middle, Sonesh Chainani, W-13.  
 Miami Beach, FL, Rabbi Alexander S. Gross, Rena Bunder, W-11.  
 Venice, FL, Venice Area Middle School, Sara Henderson, W-11.  
 Calhoun, GA, Belwood School, Tiffany Engel, W-11.  
 Kennesaw, GA, Pine Mountain Middle School, Jeffrey Fallis, W-12.  
 Kamuela, HI, Hawaii Preparatory Academy, Julie Snow, W-11.  
 Hastings, IA, Nishna Valley Community, Emily Paul, W-11.  
 Grangeville, ID, Grangeville Elementary, Maureen Fitzmaurice, W-8.  
 Rexburg, ID, Washington School, Julia Price, W-12.  
 Barrington, IL, Barrington Middle School, Bryan Quinn, W-13.  
 Gurnee, IL, Gurnee Grade School, Derrick Crooks, W-10.  
 Northbrook, IL, Willowbrook/Wescott S.P.I.E., Jennifer Holmes, W-9.  
 Winnetka, IL, Washburne School, Ian Arsenault, W-13.  
 Carmel, IN, Woodbrook Elementary School, Jared Robertson, W-9.  
 Indianapolis, IN, Park Tudor Middle School, Hannah Kaufman, W-11.  
 Lenexa, KS, Holy Trinity School, Anna Van Cleave, W-14.  
 Wichita, KS, Blessed Sacrament School, Lindsay Weilert, W-8.  
 Wichita, KS, Robinson Middle School, Chris Rupe, W-13.  
 Frankfort, KY, Good Shepherd School, Elizabeth Johnson, W-9.  
 Loyall, KY, Loyall Elementary School, Kim Wills, W-11.  
 Paducah, KY, Cooper-Whiteside Primary, Veronica Saunders, W-7.  
 Baton Rouge, LA, St. Thomas More School, Nikki Boudreaux, W-13.  
 Destrehan, LA, Harry M. Hurst Middle School, Gwen Jennings, W-13.  
 Galliano, LA, Galliano Elementary School, Kristy Lasseigne, W-7.  
 Mandeville, LA, Mandeville Junior High School, Erika Laughlin, W-13.  
 Mandeville, LA, Mandeville Middle School, Mathew Kuzio, W-10.  
 Many, LA, Many Junior High School, Dennis Carheel, W-10.  
 Ipswich, MA, Doyon Elementary School, Alison Turnbull, W-9.  
 Sheffield, MA, Mount Everett Regional School, Emily Pulfer-Terino, W-10.  
 Bethesda, MD, Holton Arms School, Clarissa Martinez, W-13.  
 Rockport, ME, Rockport Elementary School, Caitlin Fitzgerald, W-7.  
 Grosse Pointe Farms, MI, St. Paul School, Joe Piech, W-12.  
 Minneapolis, MN, Field Elementary School, Kristin Poling, W-9.

St. Paul, MN, Mann Elementary School, Kristina Beyer, W-12.  
 Clayton, MO, Wydown Middle School, Amanda Williams, W-11.  
 Springfield, MO, Phelps Center for the Gifted, Lynn Gaither, W-12.  
 Tupelo, MS, Church Street Elementary, Amber Fikes, W-10.  
 Corvallis, MT, Corvallis School, Seth Bloom, W-9.  
 Cleveland, NC, Cool Springs Elementary, Jamie Krause, W-13.  
 Cullowhee, NC, Camp Laboratory School, Alexandra Gilman, W-13.  
 Greensboro, NC, Wiley Acceleration, Sam Cone, W-9.  
 Valley City, ND, Washington Elementary School, Molly Beck, W-10.  
 Omaha, NE, Loveland Elementary School, David Goeschel, W-9.  
 2241 Bx Wassehaar, Netherland, American School of the Hague, J.T. Rose, W-9.  
 Hampstead, NH, Hampstead Middle School, Matthew Gorski, W-10.  
 Allendale, NJ, Brookside Elementary School, Elizabeth Weissel, W-7.  
 Hoboken, NJ, The Mustard Seed School, Angel Calderon, W-11.  
 Ramsey, NJ, Eric S. Smith School, Sonali Das, W-12.  
 Toms River, NJ, Washington Street School, Richard McKelvey, W-9.  
 Trenton, NJ, Grice Middle School, Tosha Samuels, W-12.  
 Albuquerque, NM, S.Y. Jackson Elementary, Michael Smith, W-8.  
 Albuquerque, NM, Taylor Middle School, Ryan Grandi, W-13.  
 Las Vegas, NV, Las Vegas Day School, Kirby Conn, W-11.  
 Logandale, NV, Grant M. Bowler Elementary, Justin Hatch, W-9.  
 Belle Harbor, NY, Upper Public School 114Q, Kevin Kuffner, W-11.  
 Dix Hills, NY, Vanderbilt Elementary School, Jacqueline Ganz, W-10.  
 Snyder, NY, Amherst Middle School, Laura Donnelly, W-11.  
 Beavercreek, OH, Fairbrook Elementary School, Amy Shoup, W-10.  
 Bexley, OH, Bexley Junior High School, Marisa Meizlish, W-13.  
 Dover, OH, Saint Joseph School, Becky Mason, W-13.  
 Edmond, OK, Sequoyah Middle School, Kristen Leffel, W-12.  
 Blue River, OR, McKenzie School, Brandi Williams, W-10.  
 Drexel Hill, PA, Saint Bernadette School, Jessica Marinelli, W-10.  
 Perryopolis, PA, St. John the Baptist School, Andrea Kitta, W-13.  
 W. Lawn, PA, Sinking Spring Elementary, Dylan Heckart, W-10.  
 West Warwick, RI, John F. Deering Junior High, Kristen Ryan, W-13.  
 Rock Hill, SC, St. Anne School, Chau Le, W-11.  
 Rapid City, SD, Rapid Valley Elementary, David Copeland, W-9.  
 Nashville, TN, Eakin Elementary School, Becca Consacro, W-11.  
 Signal Mountain, TN, Thrasher Elementary, Steve Sibley, W-9.  
 Tullahoma, TN, R.E. Lee School, Andrea Perry, W-10.  
 Blanco, TX, Blanco Middle School, Anthony Zuercher, W-11.  
 Houston, TX, Bear Creek Elementary, Megan Wilmot, W-6.  
 Kilgore, TX, Maude Laird Middle School, Christy Johnson, W-13.  
 Sandy, UT, Peruvian Park Elementary, Nicole Lindsley, W-8.

Chantilly, VA, Franklin Intermediate School, Lara Milne, W-13.  
 Killington, VT, Sherburne Elementary School, Kerstin Karlhuber, W-10.  
 Yakima, WA, St. Joseph/Marquette School, Felicia Molano, W-11.  
 Menasha, WI, Butte Des Morts Junior High, Carla Hales, W-13.  
 Neenah, WI, Coolidge School, Josh Price, W-11.  
 Whitefish Bay, WI, Whitefish Bay Middle School, Molly K. Brush, W-12.  
 Parkersburg, WV, Emerson Elementary School, Lauren Sutton, W-8.  
 Weirton, WV, Sacred Heart of Mary School, Audra Szczerbinski, W-13.  
 Pinedale, WY, Pinedale Elementary School, Jedediah Brown, W-10.

#### MEXICO FREE-TRADE AGREEMENT AND FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this special order out once again this evening to discuss an issue which we are going to be considering later this week. At the outset I should, as I did earlier this morning during 1 minutes, extend an enthusiastic invitation to my colleagues who are proponents of granting fast track, and those who are opponents to the fast-track legislation which we are going to be considering to come to the floor and challenge us. I am standing here alone right now, Mr. Speaker, but I challenge any of my colleagues who may be over here on either side of the issue, and I hope we can get a debate going here which will allow the American people to see that we are considering an issue which is very, very important.

I am going to say, as I did last night and as I have said several times in the well, and I believe it is scheduled to come up on Thursday now, that we will be facing probably, certainly one of the most important votes to be considered in the Congress in literally decades. It is a very complex issue. It is one which does not have a great deal of sex appeal, but it is one which is critically important to the determination of where it is that we as a Nation are headed when it comes to the question of providing consumers with the greatest opportunity to get products at the lowest possible price. It seems to me that moving ahead with the vote that we are going to have on Thursday is the best thing for us to do.

I happen to be very strongly committed to support of fast track. I believe that we should say to the President of the United States that you can sit down with our neighbors to the South, representatives of the Mexican Government, and negotiate an agreement. Then when you have come up with that agreement, bring it back here to the Congress, and we in the Congress will decide whether or not the very justifi-



able concerns which many of us raise have been addressed. Then if we are convinced that we have done that, we can vote for a United States-Mexico free-trade agreement. If we are convinced that it does not meet the concerns that we have addressed, we in the Congress can vote against the agreement.

It is a very simple process because this Thursday when we cast our vote here we are not saying yes or no to a free trade agreement. We are simply saying, and the reason it is called fast track is it is a term that was established following passage of the 1974 act which simply says that Congress is telling the President that he can work to negotiate a deal, and we will not start trying to amend the process, because we know that when you sit down at a negotiating table with another country you cannot negotiate unless you are able to say in that negotiating process that you are going to either have final approval on it or final disapproval on it. You cannot say you have to look at all of these provisions and then you have to take it back to the Congress, and they may offer only 70 or 80 amendments, and then we might have an agreement.

Congress, in its wisdom, has recognized that if we are going to have strong negotiations, and if our representative at the negotiating table will in fact be a credible representative, we have to do it under the fast-track provisions. That is all we are asking this Thursday, is for the House to place enough confidence in our great President and his marvelous negotiator, Ambassador Carla Hills, who is the U.S. Trade Representative, enough confidence in them that they can sit down at the negotiating table.

Many people say we have concerns about the loss of jobs in this country. I have concerns about the potential loss of jobs here in the United States, and I believe that we need to take some steps to ensure that any loss of jobs or, in fact, the pain caused by that loss of jobs is mitigated.

President Bush has come forward and responded very adequately to that question which has been raised. He has a package that deals specifically with the plight dislocated workers.

He also has recognized that there are concerns as they affect the environment. We do not want to see, as some have claimed, United States business fleeing to Mexico simply to take advantage of so-called lax pollution controls which exist there, because that cannot happen. It cannot happen because contrary to what many have indicated here in the Congress and in the media, Mexico's 1988 law, which deals specifically with environmental constraints, is as good, and some would argue even more rigorous than the environmental laws which exist here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I have quite a bit that I would like to offer. I am very pleased to have been joined by one of the most dynamic leaders in the cause of free trade and for the cause of improved relations between Mexico and the United States, the distinguished cochairman on the Task Force on Competitiveness who has worked diligently in our whip organization and provided me, Mr. Speaker, with a lot of leadership on this, my friend from Tucson, Mr. KOLBE.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I certainly appreciate the very generous remarks that he made. I would certainly return them in kind by saying his leadership on the Rules Committee and his leadership for 11 years now on the United States-Mexico Interparliamentary Group, his leadership in the whip group, his leadership in general on these issues dealing with Mexico has been very, very important, and I am delighted to be joining the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend at any time at all that he wants to make remarks like that.

Mr. KOLBE. There are several things I wanted to have a chance to talk about this evening during this special order, but I wanted at this moment just to focus on one thing the gentleman was speaking about, and that is the question of the environmental safeguards. I think it is an important one because so many people are talking about this. They have really kind of made the focus of this debate not really trade but whether or not the environment is going to be protected.

All of us are concerned about the environment, as well we should be. We are concerned about the environment in our own country, whether we are polluting the groundwater supplies, whether we have adequate disposal methods for and waste management methods for water quality, air quality, and we are concerned outside of our country.

□ 1910

We take something like the Amazon forest that I think more and more Americans, for example, have become very concerned about legitimately. We have concerns about the environment in the whole world.

I think perhaps in the last 20 years, the satellite pictures or the pictures that are taken from the Moon of our Earth make us realize what a small planet we live on and that we are all truly interdependent when it comes to the environment. I think it is important to understand, as the gentleman pointed out, Mexico has really made

some real efforts in this regard for a developing country. In fact, I cannot think of any developing country that has done as much as Mexico has done in this area.

The gentleman noted, quite correctly, that their 1988 law on the environment is a good law modeled, interestingly enough, mostly after our own environmental laws, in the areas of solid waste disposal, water quality, air quality, hazardous and toxic waste control, and disposal. So it is a good law.

Mr. DREIER of California. Reclaiming my time on just that point, I think my friend is very accurate.

I think we should make it clear that our concern for the environment centers in our districts. My friend represents a border with Mexico.

I know that there is no way in the world that my friend from Arizona would support an agreement that would potentially exacerbate pollution problems on the border which would affect his district. I know that this gentleman from California who represents an area with a great air pollution problem would not in any way support a measure which would exacerbate the air pollution problem that our friends in Mexico City suffer.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

When I moved to Arizona, and I hate to tell you how many years ago, but I was 5 years old when I moved there to a ranch just a few miles from the border. At that time the border town of Nogales, AZ, was about 10,000, and Nogales Sonora, right across the border, was about 25,000 or 30,000. Today, Nogales, AZ, is about 15,000. Nogales Sonora is over 200,000 people. That obviously just puts tremendous pressure on all kinds of problems.

We have had this in spades in Nogales with the area of the sewage and sewage treatment because of the flow. The natural gravity is from Mexico into the United States, and so we are scrambling through the international boundary and water commission to build a sewage treatment plant very much as we are doing, of course, in Tijuana, and the gentleman from California is very aware of that, to accommodate this.

But even as we have got this built, we are going to have to go on to another phase and do even more expansion. But there is a commitment on the part of Mexico as there is on the part of the United States, and that was the point I just wanted to make, that if we agree that the law is pretty good, and even most of the opponents of fast track and a trade agreement with Mexico agree that the law is pretty good. They say, of course, there is no enforcement.

Well, I think they are missing what is actually happening in Mexico. I would just cite perhaps three things that the gentleman, I am sure, is aware of. First, there has been a 630-percent

increase the last year alone in the enforcement budget for the EPA counterpart called the Sedue, for that agency, in Mexico which is responsible for the environment, a 630-percent increase in 1 year alone in the enforcement budget.

Second, in the last year, they have closed down, either temporarily or permanently, more than 800 maquila plants and other plants in Mexico for environmental reasons. Some of them have been done for a very short period of time. Some, of course, that I have mentioned have been done permanently. That is because of violations of the law.

Yet, their inspectors do not always know exactly what they are looking for, but they are learning and getting better trained.

The third point I would make, and I think this is a very important one politically, in March, March 16 of this year, just 2 months ago, President Salinas closed down the largest oil refinery in Mexico City, confronted the largest and most powerful union, trade union, in Mexico, the oil workers' union, put 5,000 people out of work, because that plant, that refinery, was contributing 3 percent of the SO<sub>2</sub>; that is, the sulfur dioxide, pollution in the Mexico City area.

Mr. DREIER of California. It was 30 percent, was it not? Thirty percent?

Mr. KOLBE. Three percent of the total pollution in Mexico, 30 percent of sulfur dioxide; 3 percent of the total pollution in Mexico City caused by this one plant alone, and he was willing to confront a very tough political choice by putting 5,000 trade union people out of work.

Of course, it turned out to be a popular decision. The people want to clean up their environment in Mexico City. As President Salinas has said to us, and I am sure the gentleman has heard this before, he said:

I do not want the children of Mexico City to have to draw the pictures of the sky without stars or Moon or Sun in it because they cannot see those things.

Mr. DREIER of California. If I could reclaim my time, I think the gentleman makes a very good point. I think that as we look at argument after argument which has been pro-pounded concerning the cleanup of Mexico's environmental problems, I think the best testimonial is the fact that the gentleman from Arizona literally represents the border. I think that our colleagues here in the House need to know that my friend from Arizona would in no way support this concept if he believed for a second that we would be exacerbating the environmental problems that exist in his district.

I know one of the meetings we had with the President, one of our colleagues said that in El Paso there was a great deal of concern about the opposition that was emanating from some

people in the business community saying what could they potentially burn right across that border that will be inhaled "by my 3-year-old child," and I think that we need to realize that, yes, there historically has been some problem, the gravity issue as far as waste from Tijuana into California and Nogales is obviously of concern to us.

But there needs to be a recognition that things do change, and under the tremendous economic reforms which are unprecedented that President Salinas has launched, we have also seen this unprecedented commitment to an environmental cleanup. It is as if they are looking directly to us as an example.

For us now, as some of our colleagues here in the House are planning to do, to slap them in the face by preventing them from negotiating an agreement which clearly will benefit the peoples on both sides of the border would be a tremendous insult and, I believe, create an opportunity for a very, very tragic political climate in Mexico which is on the move and improving.

I will be happy to yield further to my friend.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

The gentleman made a very good point that I think sometimes that maybe our colleagues need to think about a little bit, and that is that if they look at those who are supporting the concept of fast track and those who are supporting concluding a free-trade agreement, among the very strongest supporters are those along the border.

I think of myself. I think of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], and all of those very strong supporters of a free-trade agreement between the United States and Mexico.

As the gentleman pointed out, I would hope that our colleagues would give some credit to the fact that these Members who represent border districts who are the most impacted directly day to day by the environment are supporting this. We must have some view that either, first, we are on the right track, or second, we know that we can only solve these problems if we have even better cooperation.

That is the other point that I wanted to make. The bottom line, it seems to me, on the environment, and I would be interested to know if my colleague agrees with this, the bottom line is how can we expect a developing country like Mexico to do better about the environment if we do not help increase the overall wealth of the country so that they can solve some of these problems and apply some of their financial resources. I mean, the argument that

somehow we are going to solve the environmental problems by keeping them in poverty just absolutely mystifies me.

Mr. DREIER of California. The gentleman is absolutely right.

It is clear, as we improve the quality of life for the people of Mexico, enhance their economic stature, they will naturally be enhancing the quality of life when it comes to the environment.

I will never forget when we were debating the Clean Air Act here in the House, and people were talking about the potential problem as far as costs that would be increased dramatically. I said that there are a couple of benefits that are going to accrue directly to the United States of America in passage of the Clean Air Act.

First, we would have a benefit accrued from the reduction in health care costs. Imagine what health care costs are today in Mexico because of the air quality problems that exist in Mexico City, or because of the other environmental problems that exist throughout the country.

Another thing that we will have as a direct benefit here in the United States is that we, with this new technology which has been developed, is being sold throughout the world, and we have a new market for the environmental technological advances that we have made in the United States, and the sale of those kinds of devices to companies in Mexico to deal with meeting the constraints of their 1988 environmental law will benefit the United States, too, and that is something that cannot be ignored.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman makes a good point. The United States is the leader in environmental technology. We lead the field not only in the development but in the sale of environmental service contracts and equipment, capital equipment, that deals with the environment.

□ 1920

The opportunity for the United States and a country like Mexico that is clearly committed to doing something about this and wants to deal with the problem, is tremendous. It is just one more example about how exports benefit the United States and how exports have helped the United States during this recession.

The fact that we have kept this economy going as strongly as we have during this recession has been because of the industry increase in exports from the United States. This is just one example.

Mr. DREIER of California. Clearly, as we look at the global economy, as it exists today, yes, we do have problems with our economy. We have a very rough economy out there, domestically. I am convinced we can provide a role in creating jobs, as long as we export. From 1986 to today we have seen



a doubling of the exports from the United States to Mexico.

My friend from Maryland says it is \$14 to \$28 billion in exports. However, it is basically a doubling. The Ambassador, Ambassador Negroponte told me \$15 to \$30 billion in exports. We know, as President Bush has pointed out, for every \$1 billion in exports we create 20,000 to 25,000 new jobs here in the United States, and that cannot be ignored.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure the gentleman gets the figures straight. The figures the gentleman uses on the increased trade between the United States and Mexico are very phony figures. My friend from California knows it, and I know it.

Mr. DREIER of California. If I could reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I do not know this. This is the information that has been provided to me, and to my friend from Arizona by our very distinguished United States Ambassador to Mexico. I also read a wide range of other studies.

Why is it that these are phony figures? Why is it? I do not know. Perhaps the gentleman may know. I do not.

Mrs. BENTLEY. As we have said on the floor here last week, that the increase in exports to Mexico from the United States, the increase was \$14 billion. However, the increase in imports into the United States was \$10 billion. They were washouts of automobile component parts. So it was components going from here, going into Mexico, being assembled, and coming back. The \$4 billion difference is machinery, equipment that is going down there to set up the new plants and staying, which means the jobs are going over there and staying over there.

Mr. DREIER of California. Therefore, I would ask my friend, does she believe that there will not, with this free trade, be an increased market with 88 million Mexicans, who desperately want many of the goods that are today produced in the United States.

Mrs. BENTLEY. The goods from the United States are not going to be bought in Mexico because they are earning a dollar an hour or less in pay. They will not be able to afford it. We are smoking.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time on that, it is an argument which has been carried forward time and time again.

I say what I have said before. A rising tide lifts all ships. I am convinced that we are going to see economic opportunity enhanced there.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] champing at the bit. He must want to respond to that, and I yield to him.

Mr. KOLBE. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and I would like to engage the gentleman from Maryland in a little bit of this debate.

What she is saying is, I am sure she must be aware of the fact, unless she has something that shows this is incorrect or phony, that 70 cents of every Mexican dollar spent on the imports comes from the United States, 70 percent of all the imports come from the United States, is the gentleman aware of that?

Mrs. BENTLEY. I do not disagree. I do not know that is a fact, but I will accept the gentleman's word on it.

Mr. KOLBE. It is a fact, true, and been demonstrated over and over. The Mexicans have a proclivity in capital goods, consumer goods, and agricultural goods from buying from the United States.

Now if, indeed, free trade or anything that we do improves the economy of Mexico, is there some reason to believe that that economy approves and they are able to buy more, they will not continue to buy roughly at 70 percent levels from the United States?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE] and would be happy to yield to my friend from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] to respond.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, their purchases would improve. But, but we may not have any manufacturing left by the time that their economy has improved to the point that they can do it. We may only have agricultural goods left. We are losing.

Mr. DREIER of California. If I could reclaim my time, is the gentleman from Maryland arguing that we are going to have no manufacturing capability left in the strongest, most prosperous democratic republic on the face of the Earth?

Mrs. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, is the gentleman aware of how much manufacturing capability we have lost? Does the gentleman have any of his people, any blue collar people, who are dependent upon manufacturing, who are out of work today? Perhaps the gentleman does not. I have lots of them.

Mr. DREIER of California. Of course, I do. We all do. That is why I think that it is very important if we are going to compete with the emerging trading blocs in Western Europe and the Pacific Rim, that we recognize that we as a country cannot stand alone. We have to take advantage of both labor and the market that exists in Mexico, and couple that with our capital and our technology.

I think that it would be very shortsighted for members to do anything other than that.

Mrs. BENTLEY. If the gentleman will continue to yield, so we are going

to develop it all down there, and we will let it up here go to pot?

Mr. DREIER of California. I say to my friend, I have no plans to develop at all down there and let it go to pot up here. That is not our goal. Our goal is to improve both sides of the border.

I am convinced, if we look at it, the average tariff from the United States into Mexico is 10 percent. The average tariff from Mexico into the United States is 4 percent. It is clear that we are going to have a tremendous benefit accrued because the lessening of that 10-percent tariff is going to increase the market opportunity for U.S. manufactured goods there as opposed to where it is today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, and certainly my friend from Maryland does not need any help, but if the tariff has a 6 percent difference between going into Mexico and coming back, and I recall that the President just submitted a budget that was about \$300 billion in deficit, and that our Nation is spending \$500 million a day in interest on the national debt, perhaps we could raise our tariff to the same rate as the Mexicans, and therefore, lessen the burden on the people of America, as far as trying to balance our budget.

Mr. DREIER of California. If this is a proposal that my friend is offering, it is something which I think would be very narrow-minded, because we have got to recognize that the unification which is taking place amongst our friends in the Far East, including Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Korea, is something which creates a tremendous threat. Yes; a threat to the United States if we do not unite with the Americas to deal specifically with this.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I find that argument fascinating. I think I heard an echo or replay, if there had been recording devices in the 1930's in the House of Representatives by arguments made by members of my party to pass the Smoot-Hawley tariff, probably the most disastrous piece of legislation passed in this century, that changed what probably would have been a deep recession into the great depression we had in the country. The argument was that we must have the revenues because we have a deficit in the country, and jacked our tariffs up by as much as 100 percent, and this of course led to a total collapse of world trade, instantaneous retaliation from countries around the world against the United States, a total collapse of the world trade, and the worst depression in the history of the United States.

What the gentleman is arguing is to stop trade, saying we should not trade

with other countries, stop trading with other countries.

Mr. DREIER of California. If my friend would like to respond, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. For starters, the gentleman is advocating doing away with a 4-percent tariff that we are collecting now.

My question is, with a Nation that is already running a \$300 billion deficit, unfortunately I think everyone in this room is probably preaching to the choir in favor of a balanced budget, but not passing one. We are spending \$500 million a day that does not educate a child, cure a disease, pave a highway, or defend our borders.

□ 1930

So we do not have an excess of money. If you cut that 4 percent, do we borrow more money to make up the difference or do we tax our fellow Americans even more to make up for giving the folks south of the border a break?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, there is no question, and that is the first time I even heard that argument raised, because I think even the opponents of fast track or free trade would acknowledge that doing away with the tariff is not going to be that much of a revenue problem. In fact, because as we have seen from the rise of exports from the United States, it will actually result in a substantial increase in the amount of revenue to the Federal Government.

I would point out while our trade-weighted tariff with Mexico is about 4 percent, their tariff is still about 9 or 10 percent, more than double ours. If they come down to zero, the opportunity for us to do exports are at least twice as much as their opportunity to do exports to the United States. So we are going to benefit more in the short term from getting them to reduce their exports to zero.

Mr. DREIER of California. The gentleman makes a very excellent point, recognizing there will be a market there. We have seen a tremendous increase that has just been shown since 1986 in the market itself in Mexico for United States goods in that the development of United States products there has seen 80 percent of the purchases coming from the United States.

So the idea is that as we increase that export market, I would say to my friend, we will be enhancing the revenues to the Treasury because we will be strengthening the United States economically, and I think the evidence of that has been shown from 1986 to today, based on the track record that we have.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned that our tariff was 4 percent and Mexico's is 10 percent to date. Does Mexico belong to our GATT right now?

Mr. DREIER of California. Yes, Mexico is a new member of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Is not the purpose of GATT to have equal duty, equal tariffs on commodities, moving in and out of countries and equal procedures? Why then is Mexico as a member of GATT today having a 6 percent higher tariff on our goods than we are on theirs?

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, if the gentlewoman will yield, as the gentlewoman knows, GATT has special provisions for different countries who are developing countries, and Mexico joined GATT in 1986. They have a long transition period into GATT, so their tariffs remain higher.

Under a free-trade agreement, they will come down much more rapidly, so we would benefit from it.

Mr. DREIER of California. The goal of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, of course, is not to increase, but to reduce barriers; so members of GATT clearly want to see an opportunity for barriers to be reduced.

May I ask my friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland, is she a proponent of proceeding with the GATT talks?

Mrs. BENTLEY. No, I am not, and let me tell the gentleman why; because GATT has existed for some time now. You know, the only country that belongs to GATT that has adhered to all the rules and tariffs is the United States of America. The only country that has adhered to all those is the United States. As a result of it, we have lost more jobs than any other country.

Mr. DREIER of California. We continue to set a very bold example. I think that still looking towards the reduction of barriers and a recognition that we are today in a global economy is the direction that we should head in.

The fact that we have had a greater degree of compliance than other nations does not mean we can ignore it. If you take that strategy and put it further, some would argue that we should have gotten out of the United Nations. The United Nations played a very important role in bringing about the Persian Gulf resolution and the support we had there; so I think that because we are the model and because we are complying with everything does not mean that we should all of a sudden ignore it and turn our backs on improving the economic opportunity for consumers in the United States and throughout the world.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I just want to say, I think this discussion is very beneficial and I think a great deal of intensity has developed on the subject.

I have and continue to have some reservations. I think they are more about what the ultimate product of negotiations may be than whether or not we should go forward with negotiations.

Mr. DREIER of California. I think my friend makes an extraordinarily good point. I think the fact this point is being made and the fact that so much time is being spent here in the Congress talking about the final product as opposed to just the process itself signals that the U.S. Congress is clearly going to be involved in talking with and working with our negotiating team.

Mr. EMERSON. Indeed, if the gentleman will yield further, the President has written to each of us and given us assurances that that will occur.

I want to say that I share very deeply the concerns expressed by the gentlewoman from Maryland. You know, we are having this vote now at this time not just as it relates to the Mexican-American free-trade proposition, but to extend negotiations with regard to GATT and the GATT process. This is necessary because GATT produced by a deadline of last December an agreement that the United States could not buy off on, would not buy off on, did not buy off on. Much to the relief, I might say of American agriculture, that the administration did not accept what GATT produced and indeed rejected it is one of the reasons that they are now here asking for this authority once again.

I must say that I think that works to the favor of the President and the administration that they rejected the unacceptable agreement last December and are here simply asking for authority to negotiate further and to try to bring us an improved agreement.

But I want to say, I still have grave reservations. I have not made an absolute commitment as to how I am going to vote here on Thursday, but the concerns expressed by the gentlewoman from Maryland are very, very valid and legitimate.

Now, we are talking more here I think about nontariff trade barriers than we are about tariff trade barriers. I think tariff trade barriers can rather easily be negotiated, but we are all familiar with the example of rice in Japan where an American rice processor was showing his wares at a Japanese food show and was almost thrown in jail, arrested and charged, at least ostensibly charged with undermining



the security of Japan by promoting or trying to promote the sale of American rice in that country.

Now, that does not have anything to do with tariffs. That has to do with a law that flat out bans the importation in Japan of American rice.

Mr. DREIER of California. If I can reclaim my time, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important for us to recognize that Vice President QUAYLE has just been in Japan raising issues such as this. The fact that he is there and we are on the floor of the Congress talking about this and there is outrage over it, I believe will play a major role in improving what is obviously a situation which none of us support or encourage.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER of California. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me.

I just want to underscore a point that the gentleman from Missouri made and related to something the gentlewoman from Maryland was saying a moment earlier. As he said there, we did not reach an agreement on GATT last December that we could live with. We did not reach this agreement. I think that proves that our negotiators have been looking after American interests. They have been tough and they have been willing to walk away from the table when we did not get what we needed to be in our interest.

The point that I want to relate to what the gentlewoman from Maryland said as I am not quite sure that I understand what her trade policy is. I have heard her through the years discuss this. I think what she is talking about is fair trade, a better shake for the United States.

Mrs. BENTLEY. That is exactly right.

Mr. EMERSON. Now, how is it that the gentlewoman from Maryland intends to get a better shake for the United States, a better deal for the United States, if we say in advance that we are not going to sit down and talk about this subject? I do not understand how we get there if we are not willing to talk about it.

Mr. DREIER of California. I think my friend makes an extraordinarily good point and again the fact that we are discussing this, the fact that we have a history of not accepting a bad agreement and the fact that President Bush has responded with a voluminous package to the letter sent to him by the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, Senator BENTSEN, and the chairman of our Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI], raising these concerns as they relate to agriculture, the environment, displaced workers and labor, indicates to me they are not about to come back here and have us

vote for an agreement which sells our workers down the pike, which pollutes or which hurts those in the agricultural area.

□ 1940

And I think that people who are trying to utilize the scare tactics that this is what is going to happen are so far off base.

I see my friend from Arizona has brought with him something that I got in my mail today too, and we should probably drink a toast with. I had this package delivered today.

Mr. KOLBE. The gentleman should tell them what this is about.

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to my friend from Arizona so that he can give an explanation of this package that says "Danger DDT" on the bottle.

Mr. KOLBE. Of course, the piece of paper says it is really not DDT. This is the kind of scare tactics that I think the people on the other side have been using to try to convince people that somehow agricultural products coming from Mexico are treated in some different fashion, by suggesting that they are using all kinds of pesticides and other elements on those products that are not permissible in the United States.

The fact of the matter is if the product is not permissible in the United States, it cannot be permissible on agricultural products coming into the United States. I would point out fact No. 2: USDA does a higher level of testing, that is, they test with a greater sample of food products, agricultural products coming from overseas, from Mexico, than they do domestically.

And I would point out the third fact, that the rate of violation or error or noncompliance is lower, lower on the agricultural products coming from Mexico than it is from those in the United States.

Mr. DREIER of California. What they have actually claimed in this flier that is attached to this bottle which they sent along with this that says "DDT" on it, it says that DDT will be slathered on the fruits and vegetables which we will be eating. Again, as my friend points out, if you look at the fact that it is illegal here, it is illegal in Mexico, with one exception, and that is where it deals with malaria, where malaria is rampant. This is not going to be put on here. But they are using these tactics to try to convince people that simply saying we should sit down at the negotiating table would all of a sudden give us fruits and vegetables slathered with DDT. Again, it is absolutely ludicrous for people to resort to these kinds of scare tactics in trying to lobby our colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am curi-

ous. I am curious. Do not the Mexicans also have laws against drugs?

Mr. DREIER of California. Yes, the Mexicans have laws against drugs.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I have heard now that they do a wonderful job of enforcing the agricultural laws and do a wonderful job of enforcing the pollution laws. But, you know, based on their performance of enforcing the drug laws, I would have a little trouble believing that.

Mr. DREIER of California. I would ask my friend, reclaiming my time, does the United States of America have laws against the use of illegal drugs?

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. If the gentleman will let me finish.

Mr. DREIER of California. I pose that question to my friend.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. I think we do a heck of a lot better than our friends south of the border. And to reinforce a point made very well by the gentlewoman from Maryland and the gentleman from Missouri, one of the problems that we have had in the international community is that being the rule of law we have a great deal of respect for the law. We enforce the law, whether it is George Bush or someone in Purvis, MS. We do not have that sort of respect for the law in other nations.

If something goes on the books, we are going to live by it. I have not seen that with respect to Mexico.

Mr. DREIER of California. The gentleman is absolutely right that historically there has been a problem in the area of drug enforcement, environmental enforcement, problems with agriculture in Mexico. But it is very clear that we are seeing improvements in all three areas, and there have been dramatic moves. My friend from Arizona and I have served for the past several years on the United States/Mexico Interparliamentary Conference. We meet with our counterparts who serve in the Congress and Mexico.

The indications that we have are that there has been a great deal of improvement, just as there has been improvement in the environment. No, it is not perfect and it is not perfect in the United States, but because there are problems that exist that does not mean that we should penalize consumers in the United States who are hoping to buy products and also to improve the situation for the consumers of Mexico.

I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. KOLBE. Well, it strikes me that of all the issues that one might raise, that would be the one, if I were an opponent of fast tract or free trade with Mexico, I do not think I would get into what a terrific job on drug enforcement in the United States vis-a-vis Mexico. I mean if you want to compare the two countries, the number of drug abusers in Mexico actually is a tiny fraction of the drug abusers in the United States.

We have got our own problems with drugs.

My point, however, that this gentleman was trying to make, my point was not that Mexico is doing such a fantastic job in enforcing agricultural products, but we do a good job of it. We do a good job at the border. We have a system, and it works. Mexico, because they want to—at least those products that they want to import into the United States, they know they are going to have to comply. And the producers, not the government, the producers down there, knowing that they are going to be tested coming into the United States, do comply with that.

So we do have very good agricultural enforcement. Mexico is not exactly the only country that we import agricultural products from. We do this for Chile with Chilean grapes, we do it for products coming in from all kinds of countries. So we do have a system, and it does work.

Mr. DREIER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Perhaps the gentleman could enlighten me. Who does the gentleman really suppose is going to negotiate this agreement?

Mr. DREIER of California. Well, if you look at the team of negotiators that we have, it is going to be headed by Ambassador Carla Hills, who has a very distinguished record. She now serves as our U.S. Trade Representative. She has served in a number of administrations in the past. She was formerly Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. She is a Californian, I am proud to say.

She is one who, as we have all seen on television, and my friend from Arizona and I have attended numerous meetings with Ambassador Hills; she is a very topnotch individual who has, as her top priority, the interests of the United States of America as she sits down to try to reduce the barriers that exist.

We also have met with the negotiator on the Mexico side, Dr. Herminio Blanco, who is a very distinguished citizen in Mexico. My friend from Arizona and I were with him last night.

I should say I have, as I know my friend from Arizona has, have raised consistently the concerns that we have on this issue. He has made a personal commitment to me, as I know he has made to my friend from Arizona and others in this House, that he is interested in addressing our concerns.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. I do not deny anything that the gentleman says about the good intentions and professionalism and patriotism of the people who are going to be negotiating this agreement, but I prefer not to trust men or women but rather to trust the laws. I think the pudding here is going to be in the agreement that is arrived at and

not in who is negotiating the agreement.

But let me say this: I asked the question that I asked because there is a perception problem out there in the country. The gentleman from Arizona has heard me raise this question before.

The perception is that Commerce and Agriculture and the Trade Office really did not have much to do in the ultimate analysis with trade. They are always rolled over by State and Defense. Where there is a foreign policy need, it is usually immediate and we clamor in to accommodate that foreign policy need and find a way to dispense with yet another American industry or a segment of it. I am going to be looking to see if we have adequate guarantees in whatever agreement is arrived at that will preclude that sort of thing.

Mr. DREIER of California. I think the gentleman makes the point as to why it is important that we move ahead with fast track, because the gentleman will not even have an opportunity to pass that judgment, to make that determination if we do not allow the negotiating process to move forward, because I reserve the right to express the same concerns that my friend from Missouri does. I do not want to see us get into a bad agreement that ignores the concerns of Commerce, that ignores the concerns of Agriculture. The No. 1 industry in my State of California is agriculture. I have sat down with many people in the agriculture industry in California, and they have given their concerns to me. I have raised them with our negotiators.

I have said if these concerns are not addressed, I will vote against the agreement. I believe that people are aware of that.

So the gentleman has just made a very good case for proceeding with fast-track authority through the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentlewoman from Maryland.

Mrs. BENTLEY. I am very glad the gentleman is letting me have a little bit of time.

I have listened to all four of the gentleman for some time now.

Fast track means what, I ask the gentleman from California?

Mr. DREIER of California. Fast track is a misnomer. Fast track should not be called fast track.

Mrs. BENTLEY. What does it mean?

Mr. DREIER of California. Fast track simply means that the President of the United States is, under this 1974 act, granted the authority to sit down and negotiate an agreement with our partner and come back with an agreement that can either be voted for or against. That package, that negotiated agreement, comes back to the Congress. The gentlewoman from Maryland, assuming she is a Member of that Congress that will be bringing it back, the gentleman

from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR], and this gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] will all have the opportunity to, as every other Member of this House, to vote for or against the agreement.

□ 1950

We will all have a say, assuming we are a Member of that Congress as it comes back.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, we would have no opportunity to make any suggestions or changes or improvements or amendments.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the fact of the matter is, the case has been made over and over again. Do we want 535 Members of the United States Congress to be able to ensure that no agreement will ever come about? The best way we can do that is to try to negotiate an agreement without fast-track authority.

No free trade agreement has been negotiated unless it has been under the fast-track authority.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

Mr. KOLBE. The gentlewoman knows that in the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement negotiations, that indeed Congress did have input. Indeed in the last 90 days of that negotiation, Congress basically on an informal basis rejected it. Said, we are not going to accept this if you do not go back and make some changes to it, and gave very specific instructions about the areas where we needed to make changes. So Congress had an opportunity to get its input into that agreement and to make sure that we got something that was acceptable.

That informal process goes on throughout the negotiation process. Ambassador Hills, President Bush, the administration knows that there is no sense negotiating something that is satisfactory to them but is going to be rejected by 218 Members of the House of Representatives or 51 Senators. You do not have an agreement under those circumstances. There has to be this constant communication with the committees.

So there is an opportunity for that to happen, that process to happen. No, it does mean you do not amend it. You do not bring it to the floor and have amendments at the very end.

I would point out, if I might just finish my point, on the Caribbean Basin Initiative, that is what happened. An agreement that was brought back to the floor of the House, 90 percent of it was gutted on the floor of Congress. We ended up with almost nothing, and countries know that if they do not go through this process in the fast-track process, they never know where the



bottom line is. When do they know when they have an agreement if they think it is going to get changed on the floor. If you were the negotiator for some other country or if you were Ambassador Hills, you would say, I better not give away the bottom line because it is going to get made on the floor of the House of Representatives or the floor of the U.S. Senate.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend makes a very good point. To look at the disparity between the United States-Canada Free Trade Agreement and the much-heralded Caribbean Basin issue, which was debated during the 1980's, we all very much wanted to see this tremendous improvement where we were able to see the rising tide lift all ships and to help those tiny countries in the Caribbean emerge. And yet only 10 percent of what it is that we wanted in the negotiating process came about because of the fact that Congress created so many problems with it. If we do, in fact, want to bring about a free-trade agreement with our neighbors to the south, Mexico, we will only be able to do it if they have fast track authority.

In fact, the chief negotiator of Mexico and others have clearly said, unless fast-track authority is granted, we will not be able to bring about an agreement, because they recognize the track record that we have seen.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to my colleagues five points, since they brought up the Canadian Free-Trade Agreement.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, we are rapidly approaching the end of this special order, but I would be happy to continue yielding to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY].

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, Canada demands in Federal court that we accept their asbestos, claiming that our safety standards are too high. That is going on right now. Canada has notified the Energy Committee of the Senate in April, last month, that two proposed laws contain discriminatory provisions against Canadian products. Tantamount to a line-item veto by a foreign government over our laws.

Canada dumped subsidized pork. However, before the binational panel when the United States appealed, the board loaded 3 to 2 in favor of the Canadian representatives, the Canadians claimed the subsidy was welfare and continue to dump. There is no appeal procedure there.

USDA inspections were found to be too rigid under the agreement and downgraded, requiring inspection of only 1 in 15 trucks. Even when samples were found to be contaminated, the rest of the shipment was not inspected. And finally, under GATT rules, Canada is challenging our beer distribution

system, our labeling system and the handling of U.S. excise taxes. And with all of these challenges, Buy America goes down the tube under these procedures.

Mr. KOLBE. If the gentleman would yield, the only point I could think of is I think this is probably the best thing that Prime Minister Mulroney could probably have said. He is getting beaten up in Mexico for having given away an agreement that is terribly bad for Canada and weighted heavily in the United States favor. I am just delighted to hear that, for I am sure Prime Minister Mulroney is delighted to hear that he got such a good deal out of the thing.

I guess it just points to the fact that everybody thinks that somehow they lost out in this because most of the complaints on this agreement have certainly been from Canada, not from the United States.

The gentlewoman from Maryland pointed out some of the reasons why we have the processes that we do for settling these disputes. We have good dispute mechanisms, settlement mechanisms in there so that we can deal with these things. Sometimes they get a little complicated but we have those. We resolve most of those things amicably.

There are always going to be things we differ on. The bottom line is, we are both being enriched by the fact that we have more trade going on between our two countries than we had before.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think my friend makes a very good point.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to just throw this out: The process, we have a letter from the President advising us that Congress will be in constant consultation with the negotiators, as this whole GATT, Mexican free trade thing moves forward. I believe that. I have been to Geneva when the old negotiations were going on, delegations from the Agriculture Committee were regularly sent over there, invited over there. And we told the Europeans and the Japanese and other trading partners that some of the positions that they were taking were not flying well back home, and they would have to modify them, which they did not.

Consequently, the GATT agreement that fell through last December was never submitted to Congress. I cite that as evidence that I think we have to have a little faith in the process, and I agree with the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE], if I may say to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY], that if we do not go forward and negotiate, we are not going to have anything to talk about. I feel that we must go forward with the process, even though we may not like the end product, but we are going to have an opportunity.

Bear in mind this is not a treaty that only the Senate can act upon. It is an agreement that both Houses will have to vote upon.

Mr. DREIER of California. I thank my friend for his contribution. We are rapidly approaching the end of this hour. I would like to say that I, like my friend from Arizona, who has his great thick volume which he carries around with all the facts and figures on this, I had some eloquence that I wanted to share with my colleagues here on this issue, but I have got to say that I am happy I was not able to.

I think that this has been a very interesting debate. I should say that my friend from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] has just joined us. I suspect that we might be able to continue this under another special order. I do not know who else has requested time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from Long Beach, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER].

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I would just like to note that historically those countries that have been courageous enough to reach out and to try to establish new trading relationships with other peoples have been the countries that have prospered and led mankind and been the makers of human history.

The Chinese at one time in human history were far beyond anybody else's technology and their social development, but they pulled in and they became internally focused and they were protecting their sacred institutions.

This type of protectionism led to nothing but a decline that changed human history. The countries that have courage, at least enough to examine the possibilities, that is all that fast-track is talking about. That is all we are talking about with our negotiations with Mexico.

Let us examine the possibilities that there may be some benefit and see if we can reach a mutually beneficial agreement. This is what will propel mankind into higher standards of living. If we do not have the courage to do that, we are indeed going to fall behind other countries and other areas of the world.

Mr. DREIER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for his extraordinarily eloquent contribution. I think it points to the fact, where are we as a country going to be headed in the future? Are we going to try to stand alone, 50 States competing with the emerging trading blocks of Western Europe, which are going to be taking advantage of the breadbasket of Europe, Turkey, and the 100-million strong labor force and ultimately the market of Eastern and Central Europe and the trading blocks of the Far East? Or are we going to try to stand alone without unifying?

□ 2000

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, specifically on that point, it makes me think very strongly of something that the President said this morning at the White House to a group of Members that are undecided, including the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] in that group. As the President pointed out, President Perez from Venezuela had been in to see him not long before, and the president of Venezuela, "We are watching this vote with great interest." He said, "if this is defeated, it is not just a blow to Mexico or to the United States-Mexico relationship. It says everything about where the United States is going with regard to Central and Latin America."

Mr. Speaker, just to finish my point, I have heard this from people over and over in Latin America. They said, "If you defeat this, what you are saying is all the rhetoric you have been preaching all these years to Latin America about privatizing, opening up their economies, political reform, is for naught. It means nothing. It is just rhetoric. You do not intend to have better trade relations."

Mr. DREIER of California. The gentleman makes an excellent point. If one looks at the March agreement signed by Uruguay, Paraguay, Brazil, and Argentina to create their own free bloc, if we ignore this, we are going to prevent the United States of America from having the opportunity to ultimately take advantage of that new trading bloc which is developing. This is expanding throughout the Americas today, and if we attempt to stand alone, ignoring the movement of the marketplace, ignoring the movement of the global economy, we would be hurting our workers, our consumers, and I believe the rest of the free world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friends for their contributions on this. I hope we will be able to continue this discussion under another special order.

#### FAST TRACK NOT GOOD FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SKAGGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I want to remind Members of the Congress of the United States that article I, section 8 of the Constitution, says that Congress shall have the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

The issue that will be discussed on Thursday is whether or not this Congress wishes to give away its constitutional authority, whether this Congress wishes to shirk its responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I think the people of America should think about this and

ask themselves how many of them own an American-made wristwatch, an American-made stereo, an American-made VCR, or an American-made fax machine? There are none. There are none made here.

Last year in the United States of America 96 percent of all the shipbuilding was for the Department of Defense. In the past 10 years we have gone from the world's greatest lender to the world's greatest borrower. Many of those reasons are because our money is flowing overseas.

In 1964, one of the most honorable men to ever occupy the Presidency of the United States, when the issue of fair trade was being brought up then, and then on the subject of whether or not to buy rails internationally and save money on building the Transcontinental Railroad, or buy them domestically and help our economy, was quoted as saying, "If we buy steel rail from England, we have the rail, and they have the money; but if we buy it from ourselves, we have both the rail and the money."

Mr. Speaker, no one can tell us where the revenues that would be lost by cutting American tariffs would be made up, but I can assure you it would not be through the Donald Trumps of America. It would go to the middle class and lower class, as always. No one can tell me to what benefit a house full of cheaply made foreign goods would be, if none of us have a job good enough to send our children to college, or if they have no opportunity to look forward to once they graduate.

#### SAY NO TO FAST TRACK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to summarize some of the points that I was not able to get in the previous discussion in connection with the whole fast-track procedure.

Mr. Speaker, everyone should understand that the vote on fast track means that we will fast-track negotiations not only on the Mexican free-trade agreement, but also on GATT. That is very important.

Under the expanded GATT, the European Commission is making demands already. They have already said this is what they are going to do. They want to end all Buy American laws, both Federal and State; they intend to end all minority set-aside contracts; they intend to end subsidized water to U.S. farmers; they intend to obtain an increase in grazing fees to farmers using Federal land, and that is throughout the West.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in the West, and I know how important the use of

that grazing land is to those farmers out in the West.

Mr. Speaker, Buy American has been something that many of us have fought for and talked about on this floor for a long time. We feel that having this included in many of our appropriations bills at least will provide some employment for Americans, at least will mean the spending of some Federal dollars in America, and some of this money then will find its way into the various taxing arenas that we have in the United States.

Thirty-nine cents out of every dollar spent in the United States goes to taxes, and when we have Buy American requirements, this means that 39 percent of that money will go into the various types of taxes. As I said, these include the Federal Treasury, the State treasury, the local treasury, our unemployment compensation, Social Security, et cetera, et cetera. So these are some important points to remember.

Mr. Speaker, according to a trade journal, at a Columbia Institute meeting, Corrado Pirzio-Biroli, Deputy Head of the EC Commission's Delegation to the United States, said the question is whether the U.S. Federal Government can deliver the States. He said that Buy American statutes at the Federal, State, and local level have excluded EC companies from competing for an estimated \$200 billion a year in Government contracts.

Mr. Speaker, that tells me that they intend to challenge all Government contract work, that all foreign contractors will be able to come in and bid against American contractors in this country, both on a Federal and a State level.

Mr. Speaker, I question whether our contractors are going to be very happy to learn that, to be aware of this kind of competition. But they need to know it.

Mr. Speaker, there is a USTR letter from Julius Katz about the agreement on government procurement. It states:

The Code commits central governments to provide national treatment in government procurement for products and suppliers of other signatory countries. In accordance with this general commitment and other terms of the agreement, signatories eliminate any requirements which favor national suppliers or products over the suppliers or products of other signatories, such as "Buy American" requirements in the United States."

Once again, this means that our industries will not have any special consideration whatsoever. It means that the door is wide open, construction, manufacturing, et cetera, and American competition will not have any standing at all that will enhance it in any way.

Mr. Speaker, we know that our standard of living is much higher than many of those that will be competing against us, and we know that, there-



fore, our costs have to be somewhat higher. The States which have restrictions, that now have Buy American requirements, are the ones that will probably lose out: Alabama, Colorado, Hawaii, Illinois, Iowa, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, Virginia, Wisconsin, California, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York and New York City, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, West Virginia, and the District of Columbia.

□ 2010

Then there are several States which have a 5-percent price preference for in-State suppliers. That will be eliminated. Alaska, Arkansas, Wyoming, Kansas, Arizona, New Mexico, and Nebraska. And on and on it goes.

State and local government procurement represents 70 percent of the total U.S. procurement, Mr. Speaker, and Federal funding to the States and local governments represents 16 percent of the annual expenditures of State and local governments. And such Federal standing is usually conditioned by the respect of the BAR, mandated by Congress. This means that this can be attacked.

Then, so far as the small business set-aside goes, the GATT code contains a U.S. reservation indicating that it does not apply to small and minority business set-asides. According to figures of the Federal Procurement Data Center, small and disadvantaged businesses are currently obtaining between 25 and 30 percent of total Federal procurement. That will be down the tubes.

And then in the utilities and public works arena, that also will have no standing. Anybody will be able to come in. Foreign bidders will not be excluded any longer in this area.

Then one final point that I want to make tonight is on molybdenum. That is a very special metal. Super-alloys used in aero-engine gas turbines contain a significant amount of molybdenum. The cheaper U.S. BAR impacts negatively on the competitiveness of European Community aero-engine manufacturers. But if GATT applies, that means that we will not be able to keep that product at a cheaper cost in the United States. We will have to give our competitors the same kind of price.

So these are some of the problems and some of the changes that will come if GATT and the Mexican free trade agreements go through as is presently planned.

I just think, Mr. Speaker, that everybody should be aware of what the final impact will be.

Mr. Speaker, I include a number of documents for the RECORD in regard to my statement this evening.

The materials referred to follow:

#### SUMMARY OF ITEMS PERTAINING—COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES

The attached items are pertinent to the debate of the Fast Track authority for the Mexico Free Trade Agreement and the renewing of Fast Track for GATT negotiations. Included are:

##### BUY AMERICAN GIVEN UP BY US

(1) USTR letter from Julius Katz about the Agreement on Government Procurement (the Code) for GATT. It states: "The Code commits central governments to provide national treatment in government procurement for products and suppliers of other signatory countries. In accordance with this general commitment and other terms of the agreement, signatories eliminate any requirements which favor national suppliers or products over the suppliers or products of other signatories, such as 'Buy American' requirements in the United States.

##### EC AFTER \$200 BILLION GOVERNMENT CONTRACT WORK

(2) Trade Journal—At Columbia Institute meeting Corrado Pirzio-Biroli, deputy head of the EC Commission's delegation to the U.S. said, "the question is whether the U.S. federal government can deliver the states. He said that 'Buy American' statutes at the federal, state and local level have excluded EC companies from competing for an estimate \$200 billion a year in government contracts.

##### COMMERCE CLAUSE GIVES FEDERAL LAW SUPREMACY OVER THE STATE LAW

Former Rep. Bill Frenzel insisted that federal trade policies supersede states' rights under the so-called "commerce clause" in the U.S. Constitution."

##### EC PRIORITY TO EXPAND GATT CODE TO COVER THE STATES

Beverly Vaughn, director for government procurement at USTR said "that the expansion of the GATT government procurement code to include so-called subcentral entities, including U.S. states, is a very top priority for the EC."

##### AGRICULTURE

(3) Expansion of the expanded GATT making agriculture, the service industry and patents subject to international rules, which supercede U.S. national laws.

##### EC REPORT

(4) Problems of Doing Business With The U.S. It includes:

A. Export Enhancement Program (EEP). This U.S. program is against the spirit of the Mid-term review of the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations.

B. Marketing Loans: the deadline for automatic triggering of marketing loans was postponed in 1990, but this remains contrary to the spirit of the Standstill Commitment reached at Punta del Este.

C. Market Promotion Program (Targeted Export Assistance): Agricultural subsidies which are trade distorting are to be addressed within the Uruguay Round.

D. Deficiency Payments. In the Uruguay Round, both the EC and the U.S. have proposed to reduce internal support by means of reductions in an overall aggregate measure. The U.S. does not want to treat deficiency payments equally as export subsidies.

E. Credit guarantee and food aid programmes: Discussed is Public Law 480 which aims at the expansion of foreign markets for U.S. agricultural products. Agricultural subsidies are included in the Uruguay Round.

##### CALIFORNIA WATER DISTRICTS TARGETED

F. California subsidies on water: This indirect agricultural support for irrigation places community exports at a disadvantage vis-a-vis domestic U.S. production.

##### FERTILIZER TARGETED

G-1. Double Price System—Rock Phosphate/Fertilizer: Producers of rock phosphate have an export cartel. European fertilizer manufacturers are forced to pay excessively high prices for their raw material.

##### MOLYBDENUM TARGETED—AFFECT AMERICA'S AEROSPACE INDUSTRY

G-2. Molybdenum: Superalloys used in aero-engine gas turbines contain a significant amount (4%) of molybdenum. The cheaper U.S. bar impacts negatively on the competitiveness of EC aero-engine manufacturers.

##### U.S. PROCUREMENT RESTRICTIONS NOT ALLOWED UNDER GATT THE STATE PROVISIONS

G-3. Measures in areas covered by the GATT Code negotiations: The European Community considers that the following U.S. procurement restrictions should be eliminated through the current negotiation of the extension of the GATT procurement Code. These restrictions are implemented at State level, or in the so-called "excluded sectors", or in the procurement of services.

G-4. State procurement restrictions: The following U.S. States impose Buy American requirements on their procurement:

Alabama, California, Colorado, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York and New York City, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Virginia, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia.

States with 5% price preference for in-state suppliers:

Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Kansas, New Mexico, Nebraska, and Wyoming.

The States continued: comments on estimated impact: State and local government procurement represents 70% of the total U.S. procurement. Federal funding to the States and local government represents 16% of the annual expenditures of states and local government, and such federal funding is usually conditioned by the respect of the BAR mandated by Congress (refund of money is the sanction in the procurement of foreign products/services by States or local government).

##### SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE ABOLISHED UNDER GATT

Gc2. Set-aside for small business: The GATT Code contains a U.S. reservation indicating that it does not apply to small and minority businesses set asides. According to figures of the Federal Procurement Data Centre, small and disadvantaged businesses are currently obtaining between 25 and 30 percent of total Federal procurement.

Gc3. Restrictions in the sectors of utilities and public works: Listed is legislation containing provisions giving a preference to U.S. suppliers. The rules effectively exclude foreign bidders from a sizeable market. Annually, the federal budget provides \$2 to \$3 billion in capital construction funds through the Urban Mass Transit Administration of the Department of Commerce.

##### CALIFORNIA IRRIGATION DISTRICT

(5) Letter from Imperial Irrigation District, California stating serious reservations about the Mexican Free Trade Agreement and its impact on the Imperial Valley.

## POINTS TO CONSIDER IN VOTING FOR FAST TRACK

The Mexican Free Trade Agreement and the expanded GATT will be modeled after the Canadian Free Trade Agreement (CFTA).

Under the Canadian agreement and/or GATT these challenges to our laws have been filed:

Canada demands in Federal Court that we accept their asbestos claiming our safety standards are too high.

Canada notified the Energy Committee of the Senate in April that two proposed laws containing discriminatory provisions against Canadian products. Tantamount to a line item veto by a foreign government over our laws.

Canada dumped subsidized pork. However, before the bi-national panel when the U.S. appealed, the board voted 3-2 in favor of the Canadian representatives, the Canadians claimed the subsidy was "welfare" and continue to dump. There is no appeal procedure.

USDA meat inspections were found to be too rigid under the Agreement and downgraded requiring inspection of only 1 in 15 trucks. Even when samples are found to be contaminated, the rest of the shipment is not inspected.

Under GATT rules, Canada is challenging our beer distribution system, our labeling system and the handling of U.S. excise taxes.

The European Commission under expanded GATT demands:

An end to all "Buy American" laws, both state and federal.

An end to minority "set aside" contracts.

An end to subsidized water to U.S. farmers.

An increase in grazing fees to farmers using U.S. land.

Fast Track on the Tokyo Round of GATT and Canadian Free Trade put us into this mess. Many of the same negotiators will be involved in future negotiations.

This year the Canadians are harrassing us on our domestic laws. It is proposed that next year the Mexican parliament will get in the act, and after that, 99 of the GATT signator nations will jump on us. What kind of governance will the American people have after that? And what kind of constitutional protections will survive?

CANADIAN EMBASSY,  
Washington, DC.

Hon. J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, Washington, DC

DEAR SENATOR JOHNSTON, I am writing to convey my government's view that two provisions of S. 141, the "National Energy Security Act of 1991", and one provision of the Gas Policy Reform Bill (S. 662), would violate the obligation of the United States under our Free Trade Agreement not to discriminate against Canadian products.

Section 7001 of S. 341 would require oil importers, but not domestic producers, to supply petroleum products free of charge to the Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Section 1411(d) would restrict the uranium to be used for overfeed to U.S. uranium. Section 1024 of the Gas Policy Reform Bill would require that the competitive impact of natural gas imports on U.S. producers be taken into account in the regulatory approval of those imports. In each case, Canadian products would face discriminatory treatment in a manner contrary to the Free Trade Agreement obligations of the United States.

In our view there is no national security justification for measures which discriminate against imports from Canada.

I would urge that the Committee reject any proposal which would damage our mutually beneficial and expanding trade in energy products.

Yours sincerely,

D.H. BURNEY  
Ambassador.

## CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2251

Mr. WHITTEN submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 2251) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes:

## CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 102-71)

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2251) "making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 5, and 6, and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 3, and 7.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
NEAL SMITH,  
SIDNEY R. YATES,  
DAVID R. OBEY,  
EDWARD R. ROYBAL,  
TOM BEVILL,  
JOHN P. MURTHA,  
BOB TRAXLER,  
JULIAN C. DIXON,  
VIC FAZIO,  
W.G. (BILL) HEFNER,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,  
JOHN T. MYERS,  
CLARENCE MILLER,  
BILL YOUNG,  
MICKEY EDWARDS,  
JOE SKEEN,

Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,  
PATRICK LEAHY,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
DALE BUMPERS,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
TOM HARKIN,  
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,  
HARRY REID,  
BROCK ADAMS,  
WYCHE FOWLER, Jr.,  
J. ROBERT KERREY,

MARK O. HATFIELD,  
TED STEVENS,  
JAKE GARN,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
BOB KASTEN,  
ALFONSE D'AMATO,  
WARREN RUDMAN,  
ARLEN SPECTER,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,  
DON NICKLES,  
PHIL GRAMM,  
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,  
SLADE GORTON,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

## JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2251) making dire emergency supplemental appropriations from contributions of foreign governments and/or interest for humanitarian assistance to refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait and for peacekeeping activities, and for other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

## NATURAL DISASTERS

Chapter III of H.R. 2251 requires the Office of Management and Budget to provide information on the unfunded costs of programs to offset the effect of natural disasters, including crop losses, resulting from droughts, freezes, floods, and other catastrophes within 10 days of the date of enactment of this Act, pending receipt of a budget request.

In response to the reports accompanying H.R. 1281, the dire emergency supplemental appropriations Act for the consequences of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm, food stamps, unemployment compensation administration, veterans compensation and pensions, and other urgent needs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, and for other purposes, the Secretary of Agriculture has provided some limited assistance in connection with agriculture crop losses that have resulted from natural disasters during 1990 and 1991. Financial assistance needs to be provided to those who suffered losses.

In addition, the conferees are aware of the following disasters that have been Presidentially declared, that have occurred since the start of the fiscal year 1991 for which additional financial assistance will be required:

October 19, 1990, Georgia, Storms/floods.  
October 22, 1990, South Carolina, Storms/floods.  
November 26, 1990, Washington, Storms/floods.  
November 28, 1990, Palau, Typhoon Mike.  
December 6, 1990, Arizona, Storms/floods.  
December 6, 1990, Indiana Storms/floods.  
December 14, 1990, Micronesia, Typhoon Owen.  
December 24, 1990, Guam, Typhoon Russ.  
January 3, 1991, Mississippi, Tornadoes/floods.  
January 4, 1991, Tennessee, Storms/floods.  
January 4, 1991, Alabama, Storms/floods.  
January 5, 1991, Indiana, Storms/floods.  
January 17, 1991, Micronesia, Typhoon Russ.  
January 29, 1991, Kentucky, Storms/floods.  
February 11, 1991, California, Winter freeze.  
March 5, 1991, Mississippi, Storms/floods.



March 8, 1991, Washington, Storms/high tides.

March 15, 1991, Georgia, Storms/floods.

March 21, 1991, New York, Ice storm.

March 29, 1991, Indiana, Ice storm.

April 12, 1991, Texas, Storms/floods.

April 19, 1991, Maine Ice jam/floods.

April 23, 1991, Louisiana, Storms/floods.

April 29, 1991, Kansas, Tornadoes.

May 3, 1991, Louisiana, Tornadoes/floods.

May 7, 1991, Oklahoma, Tornadoes.

We need to meet humanitarian needs in other countries, but we must not forget the needs of disaster victims in the United States who deserve equal treatment.

#### CHAPTER I

#### DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE—MILITARY

##### DEFENSE COOPERATION ACCOUNT

##### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

Amendment No. 1: Restores House language that provides \$16,000,000 from interest accrued from contributions deposited in the Defense Cooperation Account and transfers that amount to the armed forces relief societies.

#### CHAPTER II

#### FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

##### BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

Amendment No. 2: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert:

#### CHAPTER II

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

##### DEFENSE COOPERATION ACCOUNT

For a portion of the expenses associated with Operation Desert Storm and the provision of emergency assistance, pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of Public Law 99-177, as amended, for refugees and displaced persons in and around Iraq as a result of the recent invasion of Kuwait, and for peacekeeping activities and for international disaster assistance in the region, there is appropriated from the Defense Cooperation Account, \$235,000,000, to be derived from any contributions of foreign governments and/or interest payments deposited to the credit of such account, which shall be available only for transfer by the Secretary of Defense to "International Disaster Assistance," "Migration and Refugee Assistance," "United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance," and "Contributions to International Peacekeeping Activities," as follows:

#### FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

##### BILATERAL ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE

##### INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE

##### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "International Disaster Assistance," \$67,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That in addition to amounts otherwise available for such purposes, up to \$200,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the purpose of paying administrative expenses of the Agency for International Development in connection with carrying out its functions under this heading.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

##### MIGRATION AND REFUGEE ASSISTANCE

##### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Migration and Refugee Assistance," \$75,000,000: Provided, That in addition to amounts otherwise available for

such purposes, up to \$250,000 of the funds appropriated under this heading may be made available for the administrative expenses of the Office of Refugee Programs of the Department of State: Provided further, That funds made available under this heading shall remain available until September 30, 1992.

#### UNITED STATES EMERGENCY REFUGEE AND MIGRATION ASSISTANCE FUND

##### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for the "United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund", \$68,000,000, to remain available until expended: Provided, That the funds made available under this heading are appropriated notwithstanding the provisions contained in section 2(c)(2) of the Migration and Refugee Assistance Act of 1962 that would limit the amount of funds that could be appropriated for this purpose.

#### INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND CONFERENCES

#### CONTRIBUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES

##### (TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For an additional amount for "Contributions to international peacekeeping activities", \$25,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 1992.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS—CHAPTER II

SEC. 201. The authority provided in this chapter to transfer funds from the Defense Cooperation Account is in addition to any other transfer authority contained in any other Act making appropriations for fiscal year 1991.

SEC. 202. Funds transferred or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act may be made available notwithstanding any provision of law that restricts assistance to particular countries.

SEC. 203. Funds transferred pursuant to this chapter for International Disaster Assistance and the United States Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund may be used for any of the purposes for which funds are authorized under those accounts and may also be used to replenish appropriations accounts from which assistance was provided prior to the enactment of this Act, notwithstanding any other provision of this or any other Act.

SEC. 204. Amounts obligated for fiscal year 1991 under the authority of section 492(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide international disaster assistance in connection with the Persian Gulf crisis shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of such section.

SEC. 205. The value of any defense articles, defense services, and military education and training authorized as of April 20, 1991, to be drawn down by the President under the authority of section 506(a)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 shall not be counted against the ceiling limitation of such section.

SEC. 206. Funds made available under this chapter may be made available notwithstanding section 10 of Public Law 91-672 and section 15(a) of the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956.

SEC. 207. None of the funds appropriated by the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-513), under the heading "Economic Support Fund," that were allocated for Pakistan may be made available for assistance for another country or purpose unless notification is provided in accordance with the regular notification procedures of the Committees on Appropriations.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conferees have agreed to provide \$235,500,000 from contributions made to the

Defense Cooperation Account and/or interest on that account to provide for emergency disaster, refugee and peacekeeping assistance in the Persian Gulf Region. The conference agreement will also allow the funding for the International Disaster Assistance Account and the Emergency Migration and Refugee Assistance Fund to be used to meet Persian Gulf emergencies and other urgent needs around the world.

The conference agreement requires that the Committees on Appropriations be notified fifteen days prior to any proposed reallocation of fiscal year 1991 ESF funds for Pakistan, except for emergency situations that are otherwise exempt from notification under current law. The conferees also agree that the Agency for International Development is to use funds appropriated for disaster assistance in this supplemental prior to using borrowing authority for disaster assistance purposes.

#### CHAPTER IV

Amendment No. 3: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment which inserts several provisions in a new Chapter IV in the bill. The first provision, in the International Trade Administration's Operations and Administration appropriation in the Department of Commerce, removes a limitation on the obligation of FY 1991 funds because of a lack of authorization for the export promotion program. The second rescinds \$8,262,000 in the Salaries and Expenses appropriation under Courts of Appeals, District Courts and other Judicial Services, in the Judiciary. The final provision appropriates \$8,000,000 for the Defender Services appropriation in the Judiciary to handle higher than anticipated payments for court appointed panel attorneys and experts. The House had no similar provisions.

#### CHAPTER V

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS

Amendment No. 4: Changes a chapter number as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 5 and 6: Change section numbers as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7: Reported in technical disagreement. The managers on the part of the House will offer a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: are off budget.

SEC. 503. During the current fiscal year, the Secretary of Defense may accept burdensharing contributions in the form of money from the Republic of Korea for the costs of local national employees of the Department of Defense to be credited to Department of Defense operation and maintenance appropriations available for the salaries and benefits of such Korean national employees to be merged with and to be available for the same purposes and time period as those appropriations to which credited: Provided, That not later than October 31, 1991, the Secretary of Defense shall submit a report on the contributions accepted by the Secretary under this provision.

The managers on the part of the Senate will move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate.

The conference agreement restores language proposed by the House and deletes language proposed by the Senate to describe the nature of the funding in the conference agreement. All funds appropriated by H.R. 2251 are either emergency incremental costs of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm or

are offset. Because of this situation, sequestration should not be triggered. By including this language, the conferees want to make clear that sequestration will not occur.

## PUBLIC LAW 480

The conference agreement deletes Senate language which would have authorized the use of 15 percent of any title of P.L. 480 funds for purposes of title II programs. The 1991 Appropriations Act allows for a 10-percent transfer.

The conferees have deferred action on P.L. 480 pending receipt of the information required by Chapter III of this Act.

The conferees include a general provision which authorizes the Secretary of Defense to accept burdensharing contributions from the Republic of Korea for the costs of local Korean national employees of the Department of Defense.

## CONFERENCE TOTAL—WITH COMPARISONS

Section 308(a)(2) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 (Public Law 93-344, as amended), requires a comparison of the total fiscal year 1991 new budget (obligational) authority recommend by the Committee of Conference with the fiscal year 1991 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills. The funds provided by transfer from Persian Gulf accounts in the budget estimate, the House bill, the Senate bill and the recommendation of the Committee of Conference are necessary to meet the emergency incremental funding requirements of Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm. In addition, the conference agreement provides a net of -\$262,000 in new budget authority which was not requested nor included in the House bill.

JAMIE L. WHITTEN,  
WILLIAM H. NATCHER,  
NEAL SMITH,  
SIDNEY R. YATES,  
DAVID R. OBEY,  
EDWARD R. ROYBAL,  
TOM BEVILL,  
JOHN P. MURTHA,  
BOB TRAXLER,  
JULIAN C. DIXON,  
VIC FAZIO,  
W.G. (BILL) HEFNER,  
JOSEPH M. MCDADE,  
JOHN T. MYERS,  
CLARENCE MILLER,  
BILL YOUNG,  
MICKEY EDWARDS,  
JOE SKEEN,

## Managers on the Part of the House.

ROBERT C. BYRD,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
J. BENNETT JOHNSTON,  
QUENTIN N. BURDICK,  
PATRICK LEAHY,  
JIM SASSER,  
DENNIS DECONCINI,  
DALE BUMPERS,  
FRANK R. LAUTENBERG,  
TOM HARKIN,  
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI,  
HARRY REID,  
BROCK ADAMS,  
WYCHE FOWLER, Jr.,  
J. ROBERT KERREY,  
MARK O. HATFIELD,  
TED STEVENS,  
JAKE GARN,  
THAD COCHRAN,  
BOB KASTEN,  
ALFONSE D'AMATO,  
WARREN RUDMAN,  
ARLEN SPECTER,  
PETE V. DOMENICI,

DON NICKLES,  
PHIL GRAMM,  
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND,  
SLADE GORTON,

## Managers on the Part of the Senate.

Mr. ANTHONY.  
Mr. KOSTMAYER.  
Mr. LUKEN.  
Mr. EDWARDS of California.  
Mr. LIPINSKI.  
Mr. STARK in two instances.  
Mr. GEJDENSON.  
Ms. OAKAR.  
Mr. FUSTER.

## SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER of California) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes, on May 22, 28, 29 and on June 4 and 5.

Mr. WELDON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KOLBE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLARZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. CLEMENT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KLECZKA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GLICKMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 60 minutes, on May 22.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, on May 22.

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, on May 22.

Mr. SKELTON, for 60 minutes, on June 4.

Mrs. MINK, for 60 minutes, on May 22.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DREIER of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. VANDER JAGT.

Mr. FIELDS.

Mr. SCHAEFER.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mr. RINALDO.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. BLILEY.

Mr. GALLO.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SOLARZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MRAZEK.

Mr. WOLPE.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. DONNELLY.

Mr. PICKETT.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. MFUME.

Mr. SCHEUER.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

Mr. GUARINI.

## SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 676. An act to provide for testing for the use, in violation of law or Federal regulation, of alcohol or controlled substances by persons who operate aircraft, trains, and commercial motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation and the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that the committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

On May 20, 1991:

H.J. Res. 141. Joint resolution designating the week beginning May 13, 1991, as "National Senior Nutrition Week."

## ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 22, 1991, at 10 a.m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1328. A letter from the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, transmitting a letter stating his full support for the President's defense program for fiscal years 1992 and 1993; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1329. A communication of the President of the United States, transmitting a letter urging the House of Representatives to produce a national defense authorization bill that reflects America's real defense needs, in lieu of the bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1330. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend and amend programs under the Older Americans Act of 1965, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

1331. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a copy of a report on Civil Monetary Penalty



Assessments and Collections, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 101-410, section 6 (104 Stat. 892); to the Committee on Government Operations.

1332. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 1991 through March 31, 1991, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (Doc. No. 102-87); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1333. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a supplement to the report entitled, "Military Bases: Observations on the Analyses Supporting Proposed Closures and Realignment" (GAO/NSIAS-91-224, May 15, 1991), pursuant to Public Law 101-510, section 2903(d)(5)(B) (104 Stat. 1812); jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Government Operations.

1334. A letter from the Chairman, Physician Payment Review Commission, transmitting a copy of the Commission's report on the Fee Update and Medicare Volume Performance Standards for 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-239, section 6102(a) (103 Stat. 2176); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

1335. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the 1991 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), 1395t(b)(2); jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PANETTA: Committee of conference. Conference report on House Concurrent Resolution 121 (Rept. 102-69). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. DERRICK: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 157. Resolution waiving all points of order against the conference report House Concurrent Resolution 121, concurrent resolution revising the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal year 1991 and setting forth the congressional budget for the U.S. Government for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, and against the consideration of such conference report (Rept. 102-70). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WHITTEN: Committee of conference. Conference report on H.R. 2251 (Rept. 102-71). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY (for himself, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BAKER, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. COBLE, Mr. WOLF, Mr. DELAY, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. PACK-

ARD, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. COX of California, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WALKER, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. PAXON, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ZELIFF, and Mr. KYL):

H.R. 2410. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 in order to promote and improve employee stock ownership plans; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. BENTLEY:

H.R. 2411. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Army to conduct a study of Baltimore Harbor, MD, for the purposes of establishing analytical procedures and developing criteria to distinguish types of contaminated dredged material and of determining the feasibility of decontaminating such material and to conduct a demonstration project to inventory the types of sediments in Baltimore Harbor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BOUCHER (for himself, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ECKART, Mr. COOPER, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. LEHMAN of California):

H.R. 2412. A bill to permit private remedies to be used for the enforcement of the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, to improve the disclosure to customers of investment advisers under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DONNELLY:

H.R. 2413. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make permanent the rule under which the monthly premium for individuals enrolled under part B of the Medicare Program is equal to 25 percent of the monthly actuarial rate for enrollees age 65 and over, to impose limitations on the rate of increase in payment amounts for certain items and services under such part, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota:

H.R. 2414. A bill to implement certain recommendations of the Garrison Unit Joint Tribal Advisory Committee regarding the entitlement of the Three Affiliated Tribes and the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe to additional financial compensation for the taking of reservation lands for the site of the Garrison Dam and Reservoir and the Oahe Dam and Reservoir, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DURBIN (for himself and Mr. SIKORSKI):

H.R. 2415. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish incentives to encourage the greater use of recycled paper for mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GUARINI:

H.R. 2416. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require individuals claiming deductions for interest on seller-financed mortgages to include on the return claiming such deductions the name, address, and taxpayer identification number of the person to whom the interest is paid; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 2417. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1949 to establish a two-tier program of milk price support to operate during years in which the Secretary of Agriculture estimates that purchases of milk and milk products by the Commodity Credit Corporation will exceed 4,500,000,000 pounds; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. REED:

H.R. 2418. A bill to extend the existing suspension of duty on N-acetylsulfaniloyl chloride; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANGMEISTER (for himself, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. FAZIO):

H.R. 2419. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to improve the ability of the United States to attract and retain qualified air traffic controllers by offering controllers premium pay for Saturday work, by raising the controller differential from 5 to 15 percent, and by eliminating the age limitation on the voluntary retirement of controllers with 20 years of service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLOMON:

H.R. 2420. A bill to require random drug testing of Federal legislative branch officers and employees; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 2421. A bill to require random drug testing of Federal judicial branch officers and employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 2422. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish Federal standards to ensure quality assurance of drug testing programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Education and Labor, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 2423. A bill to establish a private, nonprofit, tax exempt board to address the problem of negative campaigning in elections for Federal office by promulgating a code of fair campaign practices and by providing arbitration and other dispute resolution services with respect to such elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VOLKMER:

H.R. 2424. A bill to require that any natural gas rate increase be subject to a determination by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission as to whether it is just and reasonable, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KOSTMAYER:

H.R. 2425. A bill to limit the closing or relocation of functions at Department of Defense research and development laboratories; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. WEISS, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. YATRON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ROTH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. GOSS, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. HAMILTON):

H. Con. Res. 155. Concurrent resolution expressing the profound regret of the Congress regarding the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi of India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. OWENS of Utah (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. YATRON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PORTER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ENGEL):

H. Con. Res. 156. Concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 14: Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. VENTO, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MORAN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. RUSSO, and Mr. CARPER.  
H.R. 43: Mr. CONDIT.  
H.R. 127: Mr. HAYES of Illinois and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 179: Mr. MILLER of Ohio.  
H.R. 194: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. MRAZEK, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.R. 196: Mr. SAVAGE and Mr. DYMALLY.  
H.R. 237: Mr. MAZZOLI.  
H.R. 252: Mr. GALLEGLY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 303: Mr. DONNELLY.  
H.R. 304: Mr. BAKER and Mr. RINALDO.  
H.R. 317: Mr. LANCASTER.  
H.R. 318: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 386: Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. FAZIO.  
H.R. 447: Mr. HERTEL.  
H.R. 481: Mr. GREEN of New York.  
H.R. 501: Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 601: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 606: Mr. GOSS and Mr. DANNEMEYER.  
H.R. 687: Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. MILLER of Washington.

H.R. 722: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. BONIOR.  
H.R. 723: Mr. BONIOR and Mr. GINGRICH.  
H.R. 730: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. ROWLAND, and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 784: Mr. WOLF.  
H.R. 786: Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 849: Mr. BRUCE.  
H.R. 875: Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. STARK, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 901: Mr. SLATTERY.  
H.R. 953: Mr. MOODY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. BROWN, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 967: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 1076: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ESPY, and Mr. MACHTLEY.

H.R. 1124: Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. ROSE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1135: Mr. CAMP.  
H.R. 1168: Mr. STUMP.  
H.R. 1184: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. ESPY, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 1205: Mr. EMERSON, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROE, Mr. ECKART, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ESPY, Mr. VALENTINE, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 1235: Mr. MFUME, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1239: Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. SPRATT.  
H.R. 1245: Mr. MORAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COX of California, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 1257: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MFUME, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORTON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. ROE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1259: Mr. PRICE, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. RIGGS.

H.R. 1269: Mr. BROWN and Mr. FAZIO.  
H.R. 1288: Mr. WHEAT.

H.R. 1344: Mrs. BOXER, Ms. SNOWE, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1346: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. PEASE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. POSHARD, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1391: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. HORTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 1393: Mr. FROST, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. YATRON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. DEFazio.

H.R. 1400: Mr. SANTORUM and Mr. DORNAN of California.

H.R. 1417: Mr. SANGMEISTER.  
H.R. 1423: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1445: Mr. ESPY and Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 1454: Mr. DEFazio and Mr. MOODY.

H.R. 1469: Mr. EMERSON.  
H.R. 1472: Mr. EVANS, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1474: Mr. RITTER.  
H.R. 1479: Mr. MCGRATH and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 1502: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. BROWN.  
H.R. 1523: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. PURSELL.

H.R. 1579: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1601: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. RAY, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 1603: Mr. RINALDO, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1648: Mr. REGULA, Mr. LANCASTER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1662: Mr. DYMALLY and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1723: Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 1725: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. DELAURO, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 1726: Mr. DONNELLY and Mr. ECKART.  
H.R. 1750: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SABO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1751: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.  
H.R. 1753: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.R. 1768: Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. WOLF, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. JAMES, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. FALCOMAVALA.

H.R. 1834: Mr. RHODES.  
H.R. 1860: Mr. SKELTON, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. STAGGERS, and Mr. JONES of Georgia.

H.R. 2027: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.  
H.R. 2081: Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. MONTGOMERY, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 2089: Mr. HORTON, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

H.R. 2123: Mr. ROSE.  
H.R. 2175: Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 2188: Mr. DONNELLY.  
H.R. 2199: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 2200: Mr. HANSEN.  
H.R. 2229: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 2230: Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. CHAPMAN.

H.R. 2237: Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 2258: Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. BEILENSEN, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. NOWAK, and Mr. ROYBAL.

H.R. 2280: Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.  
H.R. 2286: Mr. LENT, Mr. GOSS, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 2404: Mr. WALKER.  
H.J. Res. 91: Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. PURSELL, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. MORAN, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. LONG, Mr. MURPHY, and Mr. PAXON.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. DIXON, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. SANGMEISTER.

H.J. Res. 138: Mr. BORSKI, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEACH, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SABO, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. FALCOMAVALA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. JENKINS, and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.J. Res. 143: Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GALLO, Mr. GOSS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. WEBER.

H.J. Res. 159: Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. KLUG, Mr. PARKER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. FISH, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FALCOMAVALA, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Ms. COLLINS of Michigan.

H.J. Res. 179: Mr. LENT, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. WISE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. GREEN of New York, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.J. Res. 189: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. MCDADE, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 191: Mr. CARPER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. RAY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. WOLF.

H.J. Res. 223: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.J. Res. 229: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. GREEN of New York, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WALSH, Mr. STOKES, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. RANGEL.

H. Con. Res. 35: Mr. RHODES.  
H. Con. Res. 43: Mr. ROSE.

H. Con. Res. 88: Mr. CARPER, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H. Con. Res. 145: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. PORTER.

H. Con. Res. 146: Mr. LIGHTFOOT and Mr. JONTZ.

H. Res. 108: Mr. CLINGER.  
H. Res. 115: Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. STARK, and Ms. NORTON.

H. Res. 133: Mr. FAZIO, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. JONTZ, and Mr. LANTOS.